

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1413667



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

California

BM
11
H4
V. 12-13

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE ANNUAL

BOARD OF EDITORS

DAVID PHILIPSON, CHAIRMAN

ZEVI DIESENDRUCK

JULIAN MORGENSTERN

SHELDON H. BLANK, SECRETARY

VOLUME XII-XIII

CINCINNATI

1937-1938

Copyright by
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
1938

PRINTED IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRESS OF THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Amos Studies, II—The Sin of Uzziah, the Festival of Jerobeam, and the Date of Amos	
Julian Morgenstern, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	1
A Contribution to Isaiah Exegesis	
Israel Eitan, י"י.....	55
The Etymology of Hebrew <i>māl</i> or <i>mōl</i> and its Bearing on <i>tmōl</i> and <i>'etmōl</i>	
Joseph Reider, Dropsie College, Philadelphia.....	89
Lexicographical Notes	
Julius Lewy, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	97
Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations	
Alexander Sperber, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, and Dropsie College, Philadelphia.....	103
The Mishnah Text in Babylonia, II	
Paul Kahle, Bonn a. Rh., Germany.....	275
The Death of Zechariah in Rabbinic Literature	
Sheldon H. Blank, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	327
The Custom of Looking at the Fingernails at the Outgoing of the Sabbath	
Sol Finesinger, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	347
Jeûne Musulman et Jeûne Juif	
Georges Vajda, École Rabbinique, Paris.....	367
An Arabic Story of Abraham	
Joshua Finkel, Yeshiva College, New York.....	387
An Early Theologico-Polemical Work	
Jacob Mann, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	411
On the Date of the Completion of the Moreh Nebukim	
Zevi Diesendruck, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	461
הערות והנהגות בפירוש הרד"ק לתהלים (מהדורת י"א אסתרסון, HUCA כרך X, ע' 310-443)	
Jehudah Fries-Horeb, Tel Aviv, Palestine.....	499
Grammatical Elements and Terminology in Rashi's Commentaries, Part II—Rashi's Vowel Terminology	
Henry Englander, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.....	505
Fragment of an Unknown Midrash on Deuteronomy	
Louis Finkelstein, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.....	523

About Manuscripts

I. A Psalm MS. and its Entries

II. Has Joseph b. Eliezer Hasefardi a Surname?

III. Again R. Moses Roṭi

Michael Wilensky, Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati.... 559

The Sermons of Isaac Arama

Israel Bettan, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati..... 583

The *Me'il Zedakah* (Second Article)

Abraham Cronbach, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati..... 635

Supplement to "Some Revolutionary Purims" (*HUCA* X [1935],
Pp. 451-482)

Cecil Roth, London, England..... 697

בתי הכנסיות העתיקים באלכסנדריה וסביבותיה

Jacob Moses Toledano, Alexandria, Egypt..... 701

A New Supplement to the "Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry"

Israel Davidson, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York..... 715

Max Lilienthal in Russia

David Philipson, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati..... 825

AMOS STUDIES II

THE SIN OF UZZIAH, THE FESTIVAL OF JEROBEAM AND THE DATE OF AMOS

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

I

THE SIN OF UZZIAH

2 Ki. 15.3-5 tells that Uzziah did that which was right in Yahweh's eyes, just as his father, Amaziah, had done. However, the high-places were not eradicated, but the people continued to sacrifice and offer incense upon them. And Yahweh plagued the king, so that he became leprous until the day of his death, and so had to remain in quarantine,¹ while his son, Jotham, acted as regent in his stead. As both language and thought establish beyond question, the passage is entirely the work of the Deuteronomic editors who compiled the Books of Kings. It is obviously summary in character. On the surface it would seem as if these Deuteronomic editors knew nothing more about the life and achievements of this king of Judah, even though they record that his reign endured for fifty-two years, than this mere skeleton statement. Yet other biblical data establish that this was indeed a momentous period in the history of both the Southern and the Northern kingdoms.

Furthermore, the concatenation of vv. 4 and 5 would seem to imply that the sin of Uzziah, for which Yahweh smote him with leprosy, was that he allowed the high-places, the centers of non-Yahwistic worship, to persist in the land. But these Deuteronomic editors ascribe this same neglectful procedure to other kings of Judah,² and not only do they not represent this as a

¹ *Bet haḥofšit*, literally, "house of freedom," perhaps a euphemistic term.

² 1 Ki. 22.43-44 (Jehosaphat); 2 Ki. 12.3-4 (Joash); 14.3-4 (Amaziah); 15.34-35 (Jotham).

sin or dereliction on their part, but instead they have only words of commendation for these kings and classify them as among the righteous and Yahweh-fearing rulers, those who were pleasing to the national deity. Why then should this seemingly opposite judgment be passed upon Uzziah, particularly after the statement of v. 3, that he did that which was right in Yahweh's eyes? This judgment is passed upon him by these editors, even despite the immediately following statement that the high-places were not eradicated. Something seems out of joint here, almost as if these editors knew something, or found something in their source, which they regarded as discreditable to Uzziah, something which in their eyes constituted sufficient ground for Yahweh's plaguing him with leprosy, but something which, in their zeal to exculpate Uzziah of all sin and to represent him as a righteous king, they deliberately suppressed. It might, of course, be argued that in such case they should likewise have suppressed the statement that Yahweh plagued Uzziah with leprosy. But to this a double rejoinder might be made, first, that the ways of biblical editors are devious and therefore too logical procedure must not always be expected of them, and second, the account of Uzziah's leprous condition was necessary to explain how Jotham became regent during the life-time of his father; and so, even with the utmost will in the world, these Deuteronomic editors could not suppress this statement entirely.

But if we grant that something, which must have stood in the original source, has been suppressed here, then naturally we must ask precisely what was the sin of Uzziah, because of which Yahweh is represented as having punished him in this drastic manner, and what was the particular occasion thereof. Fortunately 2 Chron. 26.16-21 makes a very definite and detailed statement of what this sin was thought by the Chronicler to have been, and this in turn offers a suggestion of what the narrative in the original source may have told.

The passage says that after Uzziah had gained his various military successes he became exceedingly arrogant and committed a great transgression against Yahweh. He entered the Temple in order to burn incense upon the incense altar. Azariah,

the priest,³ together with eighty other priests, came after him and remonstrated that the ceremony of offering incense to Yahweh was not his prerogative, but appertained to the Aaronic priests alone, who had been sanctified as priests for just this purpose. They bade him withdraw from the sanctuary, for he had already committed a grievous transgression. At this Uzziah became angry, even while he still held the censer in his hand. But at that moment, in the midst of his rage against the priests, and while he was standing in the sanctuary and at the very incense altar, the leprosy spread over his forehead in the sight of the priests. And as Azariah, the chief priest, turned toward him, and all the other priests, behold he had become leprous upon his forehead. So they drove him in haste from the sanctuary, and even he himself was eager to come forth, because Yahweh had smitten him. So King Uzziah was leprous until the day of his death; and as a leper he lived in quarantine, for he was excluded from the Temple, and Jotham, his son, acted as regent in his place.

The main implications of this narrative are clear. And it is equally clear that the Deuteronomic compilers of 2 Ki. 15.3-5 were thoroughly familiar with this narrative, if not in the form in which the Chronicler presents it, at least certainly in the form in which it stood in the original source. Obviously these Deuteronomic editors suppressed the entire narrative, with the exception of the single, absolutely indispensable detail that Yahweh had smitten Uzziah with leprosy, in order to exculpate this king as much as possible from all implications of sinfulness, as measured by their Deuteronomic, theological standards. But the Chronicler had no such compunctions so far as the reputation of Uzziah was concerned. His interest, which induced him to make certain modifications of the original narrative and to omit certain essential details, lay in a different direction.

According to the Chronicler the sin of Uzziah was that he had usurped the divinely appointed prerogative of the Aaronic priests in venturing to offer incense at the incense altar before

³ I. e. the chief priest of the Jerusalem Temple; cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood," to be published in the next volume of *AJSL*.

Yahweh. In so doing he had violated the specific injunction contained in Ex. 30.1–10.⁴ This is entirely in accord with the general point of view and basic purpose of the Chronicler in seeking to formulate and bolster up the supreme official position and authority of the Aaronic priesthood in the organization of the Jewish commonwealth of his day and to define precisely their functions and prerogatives. But inasmuch as, on the one hand, we know that the entire scheme of the Aaronic priesthood was first inaugurated by Pg and promulgated not before the beginning of the high-priesthood of Johanan in 411 B.C.,⁵ and, on the other hand, the record of the sin of Uzziah, or whatever the cause or occasion may have been, for which he was stricken by Yahweh with leprosy, must have stood in the narrative of the original source, to which both the Chronicler and the Deuteronomic compilers of Kings must have had access, and, furthermore, since this source, if not actually contemporaneous with Uzziah, must at least have been older than 411 B.C., and in all likelihood pre-exilic, it follows with absolute certainty that this original source could not have represented the sin of Uzziah as his having usurped the authority and prerogatives of either the high-priest or of the Aaronic priests in general. This last detail must be entirely the result of the Chronicler's reinterpretation of the original narrative and his suppression, in turn, of certain essential details thereof which did not fit at all into

⁴ Also Num. 17.5. The account in 2 Chron. 26.16–21 is probably a bit older than the legislation in Ex. 30.1–10; notice that Ex. 30.1–10 limits the prerogative of offering the incense to Aaron alone, in his capacity as high-priest, whereas 2 Chron. 26.18 represents this as the prerogative of the Aaronic priests in general. However, we shall soon see that the Chronicler was either generalizing or else speaking very loosely, and that he too contemplated nothing whatever except that the ceremony in question be performed only by the high-priest. On the other hand, the narrative in 2 Chron. 26.16–21 is certainly younger than the legislation in Num. 17.1–5, since that legislation seems to know naught as yet of the golden incense altar, but is apparently acquainted only with the one, single altar, the brazen altar, upon which all sacrifices were regularly offered. It seems to imply that it was at this brazen altar that the high-priest regularly performed the rite associated with the burning of the incense.

⁵ Cf. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," *HUCA*, X (1935), 108–132.

his theological scheme and purpose in recounting this narrative. Manifestly we must search further, if this be possible, in our efforts to reconstruct the original narrative and likewise to determine the occasion basic thereto.

Very fortunately indeed Josephus⁶ furnishes the information which we seek. He too recounts the sin of Uzziah, and in a manner which parallels the narrative of the Chronicler, but which likewise records a number of essential and most significant details, which the Chronicler had either unconsciously omitted or, and far more likely, had consciously suppressed. Josephus tells that on one day of outstanding importance in the celebration of a major festival Uzziah, the king, put on the priestly robe of office and went into the Temple to offer sacrifice upon the golden altar. In this he was opposed by Azariah, the high-priest, and his eighty assistants on the ground that the privilege of priestly ministration of this character appertained solely to the descendants of Aaron. But the king was obdurate and persisted in his purpose. Thereupon an earthquake shook the ground, so that a rent was made in the Temple, and the bright rays of the sun shone through this and fell upon the king's face, with the result that he was immediately afflicted with leprosy; whereupon of necessity he desisted from his undertaking. This earthquake was so severe that the mountain to the east of the city was split into two parts, which separated from each other by quite some distance.

Obviously it is to this earthquake that Zech. 14.4-5 refers, when it speaks of the earthquake in the days of Uzziah and of the Mount of Olives being split in half, with the one half moving northwards and the other half southwards, and a great gully, running east and west, opening up between the two parts of the mountain.⁷ Now it may seem at first glance that not only did Josephus identify the earthquake of his narrative with that referred to in Zech. 14.4-5, but also that he may even have based this particular portion of his narrative upon this record in Zech. 14.4-5. Actually, however, as the evidence still to be

⁶ *Antiquities*, IX, 10, 4.

⁷ Furthermore, *ge' harai* or *ge' harim* of Zech. 14.5 is unquestionably the Eroge of Josephus, with a metathesis of the two parts of the name.

presented will establish definitely, it is far more probable that the tradition, of which Zech. 14.4-5 seems to be the earliest literary record, persisted for at least four hundred years longer, that Josephus himself was acquainted with it, and that his narrative is based upon the tradition as it was current in his day, or perhaps even upon some independent literary record of it, rather than directly and solely upon Zech. 14.4-5. Manifestly this earthquake in the days of Uzziah was one of unusual severity and inflicted tremendous damage over a wide area, and for various more or less obvious reasons impressed itself indelibly and persistently upon Jewish historical and theological tradition.

However, of far greater interest and significance is the main portion of Josephus' narrative. At first glance it seems to be merely an expansion of the record in 2 Chron. 26.16-21, particularly since it too represents Uzziah's sin as consisting in his assuming the prerogatives of the Aaronic priests and performing the rite specifically reserved for the high-priest. Certainly Josephus must have been acquainted with the record of the Chronicler and must have borrowed this one particular detail of his narrative from there. On the other hand, however, and of utmost significance for this study, Josephus' narrative records a number of details not mentioned nor hinted at in any way in the biblical narrative, which Josephus could scarcely have invented himself. 2 Chron. 26.16-21 says nothing whatever that Uzziah's intended sacrifice was a part, and obviously an important part, if not the very central rite,⁸ of the celebration of a great festival, and that too a festival which must have endured for a number of days, since this particular incident, with the attendant earthquake, happened upon the most important and sacred day of that festival. Nor does the biblical record make any mention of the earthquake or tell aught of the Temple being rent and of the descent of the rays of the sun and of their falling upon the face of the king, so that he immediately became leprous therefrom.

On the other hand, the biblical record contains one detail,

⁸ Since the king would scarcely have sought to function in a minor priestly role.

which, so it appears at first glance, is not only not in Josephus' narrative, but which actually and very significantly seems to contradict a detail thereof. The latter tells that the improper and forbidden ritual act of the king consisted in his offering sacrifice upon the golden altar. The biblical record makes no mention whatever of this sacrifice, but instead tells that the improper and forbidden ritual act of the king consisted in offering incense upon the incense altar. Actually, however, there is not only no contradiction between these two accounts, but they dovetail perfectly and thus enable us to determine with absolute certainty precisely what festival, and what particular most sacred day thereof, this was.

That the golden altar was also the incense altar is definitely established by Ex. 30.1-10 and 1 Chron. 28.18.⁹ It is distinguished specifically from the brazen altar, upon which animal sacrifices were regularly offered,¹⁰ so that there is no possibility whatever of confusion between them. Manifestly therefore the incense altar of 2 Chron. 26.16 is the same as the golden altar of Josephus' narrative. Actually therefore what seemed at first glance a possible discrepancy between the two versions of the incident in question represents a significant agreement between them as to the precise spot at which Uzziah was stricken with leprosy. All the sources tell that this golden altar for incense stood just in front of the veil which separated the "holy" portion of the inner sanctuary from the "holy of holies," the innermost portion at the western end, in which Deity was thought to dwell constantly in awesome solitude upon the "mercy-seat" between the two cherubim. Into this section of the sanctuary no mortal might enter except the high-priest, and even he only once in the year, upon the Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur.

Moreover, it was just in connection with the ritual of this day, and particularly with just this ceremony of the solemn entrance of the high-priest into the holy of holies that the golden incense altar played its especial role. Ex. 30.7-8 prescribes that twice daily, when he trimmed the lamps in the inner sanctuary

⁹ Cf. also Ex. 37.25-28; 40.5, 26 f.

¹⁰ Ex. 27.1-8; 31.9-10; 38.1-7; 40.6,29; Num. 17.1-5.

in the morning, and again at dusk when he kindled the lamps, Aaron, the high-priest, should burn incense upon this altar. But in addition thereto once in each year Aaron should perform ceremonies of expiation and atonement upon this altar. This particular passage does not indicate just what occasion in the year this was upon which the high-priest performed these rites of atonement and expiation at this altar, although the use of the technical term, *hakiyyurim*, suggests that this must have been the annual Day of Atonement. This inference is, however, completely confirmed by the legislation for the ritual procedure of this great day in Lev. 16, and particularly by the specific provision in vv. 18-19 thereof, that when he would come forth from the holy of holies the high-priest should proceed directly to this altar, standing "before Yahweh," and made atonement upon it by taking some of the blood of the two sin-offerings, the bullock and the goat, and putting this upon the horns of the altar and then sprinkling some of the blood with his finger seven times upon the altar.

But even more of a role than this this altar played in the ritual of this great day. For before the high-priest might enter into the holy of holies into the presence of the Deity he had first to wash himself carefully and then don his sacred robes of office.¹¹ Then he would take glowing coals from off this altar and place them in his censer and with these a handful of the sacred incense.¹² At the moment of his entrance beyond the veil into the holy of holies proper, into the presence of the Deity, he would put the incense upon the glowing coals in his censer, so that the smoke arising therefrom might fill the holy of holies and thus safeguard him against gazing upon the face of the Deity directly and in all its dazzling radiance, and thus protect him from death.¹³ During the performance of this entire ceremony, obviously the crowning rite of the religious observance of the entire year, the danger existed constantly for the high-priest that he might lose his life or some other serious misfortune

¹¹ V. 4.

¹² Ex. 30.9,34-38.

¹³ Cf. Ex. 33.18-23; Isa. 6.5 and "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," *HUCA*, IV (1927), 14 f., 37.

might befall him because of possible improper and irresponsible ritual observance, which caused him to gaze too closely, even though inadvertently, upon the face of the Deity.¹⁴

Manifestly then there is no discrepancy nor contradiction whatever between Josephus' reference to the golden altar and that of 2 Chron. 26.16 to the incense altar. Both passages have the same altar in mind, and both the same occasion and the same ceremony. And what, in the thought of both authors, this ceremony must have been and what the occasion there can no longer be the slightest doubt. It must have been this very ceremony, that of the entrance of the high-priest, clad in his sacred robes, into the holy of holies, into the presence of the Deity, upon the annual Day of Atonement. It was this ceremony, the especial duty and prerogative of the high-priest alone, which, according to both the Chronicler and Josephus, Uzziah, the king, had arrogantly claimed for himself. According to both these authors this was the sin of Uzziah, for which Yahweh smote him with leprosy; and, even though not explicitly stated in either source, none the less by implication, it is clear, Yom Kippur must have been the great, festal day upon which Uzziah committed his transgression, and also upon which the earthquake, with all its attendant circumstances, transpired.

But we know that this could not have been at all the sin of Uzziah or the immediate cause of his leprosy, nor could Yom Kippur have been represented as the festal occasion thereof, in the original source, upon which, as we have seen, both the Chronicler and Josephus must have drawn. That source, if not actually contemporaneous and pre-exilic, was certainly older than 411 B.C. and the promulgation of Pg in the high-priesthood of Johanan. It therefore knew nothing whatever of the Aaronic priesthood or of the office of the high-priest and its special duties and prerogatives. Consequently it could not possibly have told that the sin of Uzziah consisted in the arrogant seizure of Aaronic priestly authority and the performance of an all-impor-

¹⁴ Lev. 16.2,12-13; cf. also Mishnah Yoma, V, 1-5 and Lauterbach, "A Significant Controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees," *HUCA*, IV (1927), 173-205.

tant rite which, according to the divinely revealed legislation of the Priestly Code, could be performed by the high-priest alone. Still less could, in the original source, the occasion upon which Uziah performed this ceremony have been Yom Kippur, since, as we have shown conclusively elsewhere,¹⁵ Yom Kippur as such did not come to be celebrated until, at the very earliest, about the middle of the 4th century B.C. Of this Josephus must have been fully aware when, instead of telling that it was Yom Kippur upon which Uziah officiated in this manner, he told rather that it was in the course of the celebration of a great festival, and upon the most important day thereof that this incident transpired.

The import of this statement of Josephus is unmistakable. In the references just cited we have shown that under both Calendars I and II and even in the early stages of Calendar III, in fact until some time after the accession of Johanan to the high-priesthood in 411 B.C., the Asif or Sukkot festival was celebrated during the last seven days of the year, followed, of course, immediately by the New Year's Day upon the first day of the new year. Under Calendar I, and until the introduction of Calendar II at the time of the Deuteronomic Reformation in 621 B.C., the Asif festival was celebrated accordingly upon the last seven days of the month, Etanim, presumably the last month of the year under the conditions of Calendar I, and the New Year's Day was celebrated upon the first day of the month, Bul, presumably the first month of the year according to this Calendar. Under Calendar II and in the early stages of the evolution of Calendar III, i. e. from 621 B.C. to about the middle of the 4th century B.C., the Asif festival was celebrated from the 3rd through the 9th of the seventh month, with the New Year's Day upon the 10th of that month. Although apparently theoretically distinct from each other, the two festivals were necessarily celebrated together and for all practical purposes constituted one, single festival, with the seven days of the Asif

¹⁵ Cf. "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals," *JQR* (n. s.), VIII (1917), 31-54; "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," *HUCA*, I (1924), 22-58; "The Gates of Righteousness," *HUCA*, VI (1929), 1-37; "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 1-148.

festival accordingly having much the character of a festal period preparatory to the inauguration of the new year, and the New Year's Day in turn having in consequence much the character of the climax of the celebration throughout the entire eight days festal period. It was therefore truly the most important day of this joint, eight-days festival.

In the course of the evolution of Calendar III the New Year's Day was transferred to the 1st of the seventh month, and the Asif, or the Sukkot festival, as it had now come to be called,¹⁶ was in turn separated from all connection with the New Year's Day and made to follow, instead of preceding it as formerly, and transferred to the 15-21st of the seventh month. Eventually an eighth day of celebration, of rather colorless and nondescript character, was added to the Sukkot festival, no doubt in reminiscence of the fact that there had originally been actually eight days of celebration in connection with the observance of the Asif festival. Apparently too, despite this rearrangement of the dates of these two festivals, the consciousness persisted that the 10th of the seventh month had been from of old a day of paramount importance and sanctity, with the result that eventually, in the course of the evolution of Calendar III, a new festival was introduced and set upon this day, Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement. Almost immediately this day became regarded as the most important and sacred occasion in the entire, new festival calendar. Most of the former rites of the old New Year's Day, with apparently the single exception of the significant ceremony of blowing the trumpet,¹⁷ were now linked with the celebration of this Day of Atonement, and above all the rite of the entrance of the high-priest into the holy of holies, into the presence of the Deity, his solemn emergence therefrom and the attendant expiatory rites, and particularly those at the golden incense altar and the sending forth of the scapegoat into the desert.

From all this it is clear that the actual occasion upon which Uzziah performed the expiatory rites at the golden incense

¹⁶ "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 53-72.

¹⁷ Cf. Lev. 23.24.

altar, as the combination of the versions of the Chronicler and Josephus would put it, must have been, not the comparatively late Day of Atonement, entirely unknown in Uzziah's day, but rather the ancient New Year's Day, as it was celebrated in Uzziah's time under the conditions of Calendar I, then in vogue. This conclusion accords perfectly with Josephus' statement that this happened in the course of the celebration of a great festival and upon the most important day thereof.

This conclusion receives significant and definitive confirmation from one other datum recorded by Josephus. He tells that through the cleft in the Temple made by the earthquake the rays of the sun penetrated and fell upon Uzziah's face, so that he became leprous. Now the ceremony of the descent of the sacred fire into the sanctuary is still observed in the Church of the Sepulchre in Jerusalem on the Saturday afternoon preceding Easter Sunday.¹⁸ In relation to the moment of the spring equinox it bears precisely the same relationship which the corresponding ceremony in the Jerusalem Temple bore to the moment of the fall equinox. This ceremony was a regular element in the celebration of the ancient New Year's Day in the

¹⁸ Note that in the oldest accounts of the rite, the light is generally depicted as descending from on high, cf. the accounts of Bernard the Wise (867) (in Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, 27 [together with the note]), and Maundrell (1697) (*ibid.*, 462 ff.); also three very important treatments of this rite, Bernhard Schmidt, "Die Feier des heiligen Feuers in der Grabeskirche," *PJB*, XI (1915), 85-118; Hartmann, "Arabische Berichte über das Wunder des heiligen Feuers," *PJB*, XII (1916), 76-96; Schmaltz, "Das heilige Feuer in der Grabeskirche im Zusammenhang mit der kirchlichen Liturgie und den antiken Lichtriten," *PJB*, XIII (1917), 53-102. However, normally, of course, the first rays of the rising sun upon the day of the fall equinox, the New Year's Day, entered into the Temple, not from above, through the cupola or an opening in the roof or a rift in the building caused by an earthquake, such as is described by Josephus, but through the eastern gate, regularly kept tightly closed, but opened on just this one day for just this purpose (cf. "The Gates of Righteousness," 1-37). Obviously the entrance of the rays of the sun, the *kēbod Yahweh*, through the fissure in the Temple caused by the earthquake, was an abnormal condition, a manifestation of Yahweh's wrath against the king. For other, parallel instances of the revelation of the *kēbod Yahweh* as a manifestation of divine anger and means of punishment, cf. Lev. 10.1-2; Num. 11.1; 14.10; 16.19b, 35; 17.7, 11.

Temple in Jerusalem on the 1st of Bul, under the conditions of Calendar I, and on the 10th of the seventh month under the conditions of Calendar II.¹⁹ It was this particular portion of the celebration of the day which symbolized of old the entrance of the Deity into the Temple,²⁰ and which came in time to be known as "the coming of the *k'ebod Yahweh*."²¹ Only upon this one day in the year was the sacred fire thought to descend from Yahweh upon the altar.²² This is proof positive that the sacred day in question, upon which Uzziah officiated in high-priestly capacity at the golden incense altar in the Temple at Jerusalem, was, as the original source must have recorded plainly, the New Year's Day, celebrated in Uzziah's time, a century and a quarter before the Deuteronomic Reformation and the introduction of Calendar II, still upon the 1st of Bul.

And still one other significant bit of evidence confirms this conclusion absolutely and throws additional light upon this and other important, related matters. The Targum paraphrases the clause in Isa. 28.21a, *k'har p'erašim yaqum Yahweh*, thus, *k'ma' d'za'u ṭuraya' kad 'itg'li y'kara' d'Yahweh b'ṣome 'Uzziyah malka'*, "just as the mountains moved when the 'glory of Yahweh' manifested itself in the days of King Uzziah." We have seen that Josephus' version of the incident under consideration told that just at the moment when Uzziah was performing the ceremony at the golden incense altar a terrible earthquake cleft the Temple, so that the rays of the sun shone through upon the face of the king. This was the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, to which Zech. 14.4-5 refers, which rent the Mount of Olives, east of the city in twain and caused the two halves to separate by quite some distance, so that a great gully opened up between them. Unquestionably it is to this

¹⁹ Cf. "The Gates of Righteousness," 31-37.

²⁰ Cf. Isa. 6.1-4 and "The Book of the Covenant, I," *HUCA*, V (1928), 48-58.

²¹ Perhaps some reminiscence thereof may be discerned in the vague and, not improbably, early revised clause in 2 Chron. 26.18ba, *w'lo' l'ka l'kabod miYahweh 'elohim*.

²² This interesting and important matter will be developed more fully in a subsequent article, to be entitled, "The Fire upon the Altar."

same incident, or, perhaps more exactly, to this same tradition thereof, that not only the Targumic paraphrase, but also the original biblical clause itself refer. And here, very significantly, the Targumic paraphrase makes reference to that one most important element of the tradition, about which all the biblical references are significantly silent, but which Josephus records in full detail, and which, more than all else, links this incident with the New Year's Day, viz. the revelation of the "glory of Yahweh," i. e. unquestionably Josephus' ray of light which fell upon the face of the king and caused his leprosy. And while the Targumic paraphrase does not mention the earthquake specifically, that it actually has in mind this earthquake in the days of Uzziah is beyond all question, as the expression, "when the mountains moved," indicates; and it links this earthquake with the manifestation of the "glory of Yahweh" unto, or rather, against, Uzziah. Obviously the Targum had in mind precisely the same tradition as did Josephus, and that in all its significant details, plainly still current in the days of both Josephus and the Targumist, and unquestionably known also to the Chronicler and to the Deuteronomic editors of 2 Ki. 15.5, but consciously suppressed by both these writers because of their peculiar theological motivations.

And not this alone, but undoubtedly the Targumist was correct in his interpretation of the clause in Isa. 28.21a α as referring to this earthquake. The passage is comparatively late,²³ perhaps not earlier than Zech. 14.4-5; but be that as it may, the fact remains that we have in late prophetic literature, from the fourth century B.C. in all likelihood, and therefore somewhat earlier no doubt than the Chronicler, two specific and seemingly independent references to the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, which record certain details which must have stood in the original source, but which have been suppressed by the Deuteronomic editors of 2 Ki. 15.5 and the Chronicler, but which come to light again in their full significance in Josephus' version of this same incident and in the Targumic paraphrase of Isa. 28.21a α , and which definitely link the unhappy experience

²³ Probably a gloss; cf. the modern commentaries.

of Uzziah and the earthquake which cleft the Temple and the neighboring Mount of Olives with the old New Year's Day and its regular, official celebration.²⁴ In this connection quite significantly rabbinic tradition records that Uzziah was stricken with leprosy upon the very same day upon which Isaiah beheld his vision of Yahweh enthroned in the Temple and heard Him pronouncing His judgment upon the nation.²⁵ As I have endeavored to show elsewhere,²⁶ this day of Isaiah's beholding the Deity enthroned in the Temple, this Day of Judgment and of the revelation of the "glory of Yahweh,"²⁷ could have been naught but the New Year's Day. This is indeed a widely ramifying and incontrovertible chain of evidence, all pointing unmistakably to this one conclusion.

One other most important and illuminating detail of the tradition now likewise becomes clear. Unquestionably Uzziah functioned upon this occasion in the capacity of chief priest of the Temple at Jerusalem upon the New Year's Day, not through any undue seizure of high-priestly authority not rightfully his, but solely because he actually filled this role as a part of the regular duties of his office as king. The contention of both 2 Chron. 26.16-21 and Josephus that this was a usurpation of office and that this ritual function properly belonged to the

²⁴ Rashi, to Zech. 14.5, interprets the shaking of the threshold in Isa. 6.4 as the result of the earthquake upon the day Uzziah was smitten with leprosy; so also Kimḥi, to the same passage. Kimḥi, just as Jerome before him, likewise identifies this earthquake with that of Amos 1.1.

²⁵ Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, IV, 262. Actually, of course, the rabbinic tradition is not historically correct, for it is based upon an artificial interpretation of *mot* in Isa. 6.1 as meaning "leprosy." But Isa. 6.1 tells that the vision in the Temple came to the prophet in the year of Uzziah's death, and not at all in the year and at the moment of his first being smitten with leprosy. As 2 Ki. 15.5 and 2 Chron. 26.21 clearly imply, the leprous condition of Uzziah and the regency of Jotham endured for some time, probably even for a number of years. But this very historical inaccuracy of the rabbinic tradition makes its identification of the day of the earthquake of Amos 1.1 and of the affliction of Uzziah with the day of Isaiah's vision, of the revelation of the *kēbōd Yahweh* and of divine judgment upon the nations, i. e. with the New Year's Day, doubly significant.

²⁶ "The Book of the Covenant," I, 48 ff.

²⁷ Cf. Isa. 6.3.

high-priest rests, of course, upon the altogether historically incorrect assumption that the Aaronic priesthood had been instituted already by Moses, whereas we know that this was a fiction coined by the authors of the Priestly Code at or near the very end of the 5th century B.C.²⁸ Beyond all question throughout the entire pre-exilic period the king functioned likewise as the chief priest in the Temple at Jerusalem,²⁹ and in this capacity it must have been he himself, or else perhaps on occasion his surrogate, who upon each New Year's Day performed the specific rite, actually the most important rite of the entire eight day period of festal celebration, of entering the holy of holies, or, perhaps better, in the pre-exilic Temple, the *d'bir*, into the very presence of the Deity, with the smoking censer in his hand, and who then, upon coming forth from the holy of holies, proceeded to the golden altar in front of the sacred veil, or in the pre-exilic Temple, whatever form of incense altar may have served the same purpose,³⁰ and began the detailed expiatory rites.

We are now in a position to determine with almost complete certainty precisely what the narrative in the original source, upon which, as we have seen, the Deuteronomic compilers of 2 Ki. 15.5, the Chronicler and also Josephus must have based their respective records of this event, must have told. It must have been a fairly simple narrative, and one which, in its own day and in the light of the ritual conditions and theological concepts then prevailing, must have been thoroughly natural and comprehensible. It must have told that upon a certain New Year's Day, while King Uzziah, in his capacity of chief priest of the Southern Kingdom, had just entered into the presence of the Deity in the innermost part of the sanctuary, and was just about to come forth, or perhaps had actually just come forth, therefrom, a terrible earthquake shook the entire land, an earthquake so severe that the Mount of Olives, east of the city, was violently moved, or perhaps even, as the tradition in Zech.

²⁸ Cf. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 122, note 193.

²⁹ Cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood."

³⁰ Cf. 2 Ki. 16.10-16.

14.4-5 and the Targum to Isa. 28.21aα has it, was split in twain, and the Temple itself was reft. Through the opening thus made in the Temple the first rays of the sun shone in and fell upon the face of the king. The moment must have been just at sunrise; the king must have been standing either just within or just in front of the innermost shrine at the far, western end of the Temple.³¹ At this moment too leprosy manifested itself upon the face of the king. The original narrative must have accounted for both the terrible earthquake, with all its far-reaching destruction, a veritable national calamity, and for the affliction of the king by the implication, if not by the direct statement, that in some way or other the king had ventured to perform the all-important ceremony, that upon which the good fortune of the entire nation during the ensuing year depended very largely, in some unorthodox or improper manner, with the result that the Deity was displeased, and manifested His anger immediately and in this dire manner.³² Of course Uzziah's leprosy was defiling both to himself and to the sanctuary. In consequence he was removed from the Temple as quickly as possible and placed in quarantine for the remainder of his life, and his son, Jotham, functioned as regent in his stead. So the original narrative must have told; hardly anything more than this.

Accordingly, it is clear, to the authors of the original narrative, just as to the people of his own day, the sin of Uzziah must have consisted in the unorthodox and improper performance of some detail of the momentous New Year's Day

³¹ Cf. "The Gates of Righteousness," 29-37.

³² The incident thus parallels almost exactly the account in Lev. 9.22-10.3 (cf. my "On Leviticus 10.3," *Paul Haupt Anniversary Volume*, 97-102) of the death of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, upon this same occasion and for a similar cause, and also the story of Korah and his followers in the Pg stratum of Num. 16 (cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood"). Not impossibly the very name, Azariah, which both 2 Chron. 26.16-21 and Josephus give to the chief priest in the Temple, may be but a reflection of the actual name of the king himself, as recorded in 2 Ki. 15, undoubtedly the older source. In other words, it may be that the narratives in 2 Chron. 26.16-21 and Josephus even preserve a reminiscence of the fact that the king, Azariah-Uzziah, actually functioned likewise as chief priest in the temple; cf. also 1 Chron. 5.36 and Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, VI, 357, note 29.

ritual, a grievous offense indeed, which for them accounted quite adequately for both the affliction of the king, an affliction tantamount in a general way to death itself, and for the devastating earthquake and its cataclysmic results, affecting the entire nation.

This complete narrative, with the exception of the single detail of the leprosy of Uzziah, which brought Jotham to the throne as regent during the remaining years of his father's existence, the Deuteronomic authors of 2 Ki. 15.5 suppressed, since their purpose was to represent Uzziah as a Judean king who conformed righteously to their Deuteronomic theological pattern. Not bound by this standard, the Chronicler, somewhat later, and Josephus after him, had no scruples whatever in recording that Uzziah was punished by the Deity because of a grievous sin; but, measured by their standards, the sin of Uzziah could no longer consist merely in the improper performance by him of some detail of the ritual. Proceeding, as of necessity they had to do, from the assumption of the divinely instituted Aaronic priesthood, they could tell only that the sin of Uzziah, and a grievous sin indeed measured by the standards of the Priestly Code and its theological principles,³³ consisted, not in the improper performance of some detail of the all-important rite, but far rather in the arrogant assumption by the king of priestly authority not rightfully his and his open defiance of the Deity and frustration of His purposes and appointed institutions. Thus we can account simply and easily for the form which the original narrative assumed at the hands of both the Chronicler and Josephus.

But, as we have seen, some details of the original narrative persisted long in Jewish tradition in much the form which they had had from the first, and particularly that of the earthquake. It must have been an earthquake of unusual intensity, with devastating effects which reached far out beyond Jerusalem itself. In fact Jerusalem may not even have been the epicenter of the earthquake, and destructive though it seems to have been in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, it may have wrought

³³ Cf. Num. 17.5.

even greater disaster in some other not too distant locality. And both the extreme ravaging effects of this particular earthquake and also the fact that it happened, most dramatically, just upon the New Year's Day, the dread Day of Judgment, and just at the moment when the king was about to come forth from the presence of the Deity, with the consequence that the king himself was smitten with leprosy, a manifest and extreme act of divine judgment, must have tended to make this particular earthquake survive very long in tradition as the pattern of all destructive earthquakes and of Yahweh's judgment and punishment thereby. Accordingly the author of Zech. 14,³⁴ and apparently also the author of Isa. 28.21, as well as the Targumist thereof, could readily represent a violent, devastating earthquake, one after the pattern of that in the days of Uzziah, with the Mount of Olives again split in twain and the people fleeing in futile panic into the recesses of the mountains, just where the devastation would be greatest, as one of the incidents of the Day of Yahweh, manifestly the great Day of Judgment, coming beyond all doubt upon the New Year's Day,³⁵ and settling the destinies both of Yahweh's own people and of the other nations and their mutual relations forever.³⁶

³⁴ Of course with the omission of all secondary matter, such as the clause, *ki yaggi'a . . . w'enastem*, in v. 5.

³⁵ A thesis ably and convincingly established by two undergraduate pupils of mine, as yet unpublished. Also in quite a number of other late post-exilic forecastings of the Yom Yahweh the earthquake has become a conventional feature, an earthquake of such extreme character that it destroys not only the entire earth but likewise overturns heaven itself; cf. Isa. 13.13; 24.18; Jer. 4.24; Ezek. 38.18-23; Joel 2.10 ff. Unquestionably the great earthquake upon the New Year's Day in the reign of Uzziah was the source of this concept.

³⁶ The plague described in Zech. 14.12, with which Yahweh will afflict the enemy suddenly and drastically, even while they are still standing, each upon his own feet, so that their flesh shall be quickly consumed and their eyes in their sockets and their tongues in their mouths shall waste away, seems to resemble an extreme and speedy form of leprosy and may well be an additional detail of Yahweh's destruction upon this Day of Judgment suggested by the incident in the original narrative of Uzziah's leprosy upon the parallel occasion. The implication of the original narrative that Uzziah became leprous in this single moment, that, in other words, his

The consideration of the evidence thus far presented and the conclusions which have been reached now lead us on one step further, to an investigation of another incident recorded in biblical literature, which in many and very significant respects, as we shall see, bears a close resemblance and even a direct relationship to the incident which we have just studied, viz:

II

THE FESTIVAL OF JEROBEAM I

1 Ki. 12.31–33 reads as follows: "And he (Jerobeam I) made sanctuaries, and he appointed as priests certain ones of the people who were not of the sons of Levi. And Jerobeam celebrated a festival in the eighth month, upon the 15th of the month, like the festival which is in Judah; and he went up³⁷ upon the altar; thus he did in Bethel, to sacrifice to the calves which he had made; and he stationed in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made.³⁸ And he went up³⁷ upon the altar which he had made in Bethel upon the 15th of the eighth month, in the month which he devised out of his own mind, and he celebrated the festival for the children of Israel, and he went up³⁹ upon the altar in order to burn incense."

leprosy became manifest instantaneously, and that he himself became immediately aware thereof and panic-stricken thereby (2 Chron. 26.20b), is that the original narrative itself told that this case of leprosy, sent by Yahweh as a divine punishment for the blasphemous conduct of the king, was of this sudden and extreme character. For leprosy as the regular punishment for impiety such as that of Uzziah upon this occasion, cf. Ginzburg, *op. cit.*, VI, 358, note 30. Not improbably a faint reminiscence of the tradition that Uzziah's leprosy resulted from the rays of the rising sun falling upon his face may be seen in the peculiar and, in biblical literature, otherwise unparalleled expression, *w^ehašora'al zar^eḥaḥ b^emišḥo* (but for an interesting and significant rabbinic parallel, cf. Ber. r. XXII, 27).

³⁷ Or "offered up sacrifices," cf. below, note 39.

³⁸ Or "whom he had appointed."

³⁹ Here the consecution, *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḥ l^eḥaḥṭir*, permits us to interpret *waya'al* only as "he went up upon," and not as "he sacrificed"; therefore in the preceding instances we have offered this as the preferential interpretation of this expression.

That this passage is out of order, and particularly that it is disjointed, redundant and overloaded, is self-apparent both in the original Hebrew and in the translation. Three times in the courses of two verses we are told that Jerobeam went up upon the altar. Manifestly before the passage can be correctly interpreted it must be carefully analyzed and its original reading and content determined. Fortunately this task is not difficult.

Still another unnecessary and disturbing repetition or duplication exists in these verses as further evidence of editorial overloading. Twice we read that Jerobeam celebrated his festival in the eighth month, upon the 15th of the month. V. 32 reads at present, "And Jerobeam celebrated a festival in the eighth month, upon the 15th of the month, like the festival which is in Judah." Now when we bear in mind that according to the chronology of Pg the Sukkot festival was celebrated from the 15th through the 21st, and later through the 22nd, of the seventh month,⁴⁰ the impression is at once conveyed that Jerobeam deliberately celebrated his festival in Bethel precisely one month later than the corresponding festival was celebrated in the Southern Kingdom, and that his great sin, for which Yahweh punished him so grievously, consisted in thus consciously and arrogantly, to further his own purposes, changing a festal date which had been fixed and instituted by the Deity Himself. Precisely this is the direct import of the clause, "which he devised out of his own mind," which follows the dating of the festival upon the 15th day of the eighth month in v. 33. This has, quite naturally, been the traditional interpretation of this passage and conception of the sin of Jerobeam. And not at all surprisingly, this dating of the festival here has caused great confusion in the minds of biblical scholars.

The first question which arises here is just why Jerobeam should have changed the date of the festal celebration for the Northern Kingdom, and in particular, just why he should have set it precisely one month to the day later than the date of the corresponding festival in Judah. The customary answer is

⁴⁰ Cf. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 72-108.

that suggested by vv. 26-28, that this was a part of Jerobeam's program to prevent the people of the Northern Kingdom from visiting the great Southern sanctuary in Jerusalem and thus coming again, from year to year, under the influence of their former rulers, the dynasty of David. At first thought this seems a plausible answer, and, in all likelihood, just this is what, in part at least, the late Priestly glossators who interpolated this dating here had in mind. But second thought shows the utter fallacy of this argument. Bearing in mind the readiness and strong inclination of the people of Palestine, from the earliest times to the present day, to pilgrim to various important shrines during the festal seasons in order to participate in the joyous and enticing festal rites,⁴¹ we must realize that the people of the Northern Kingdom would have liked nothing better than just the arrangement which the dating here suggests; for with the Sukkot festival celebrated in the Northern Kingdom a month later than it was celebrated in the South, the people of both kingdoms would have been enabled to visit both Jerusalem and Bethel and participate in the merry festal ceremonies at both sanctuaries. By such an arrangement Jerobeam would have defeated the very purpose here attributed to him. He could have achieved the desired end only by celebrating his festival at Bethel at precisely the same time as the corresponding festival was celebrated in Jerusalem. Viewed from this angle the dating here is suspicious indeed.

And viewed from another angle this suspicion becomes crystalized into fact. Religious festivals, particularly when celebrated by a people as yet none too far advanced from that early stage of cultural evolution when conditions of nature are still paramount considerations, can not easily be changed arbitrarily to meet the whims or even the political schemings of kings. The Sukkot, or, as it was called still in the days of Jerobeam, the Asif festival,⁴² was essentially an agricultural festival, the moment of the celebration of which bore a definite

⁴¹ Cf. Amos 4.4-5.

⁴² "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 142, note 30.

relation to the season of the year and the state of the harvest. Still as late as the Deuteronomic Reformation, three hundred years after Jeroboam I, the only dating given for the celebration of this festival was "when thou dost gather in (thy harvest) from thy threshing-floor and wine-press." Contrary to the customary interpretation, this festival was originally much more than the occasion for mere thanksgiving to the Deity for the blessing of the crop. In the course of its eight days of celebration various rites of widely ranging nature were performed, of homoeopathic magical character, designed to secure suitable weather conditions and to further the growth of the crop, and thus ensure an adequate food supply for the ensuing year.⁴³ Upon the proper performance of these rites the very life of the entire people depended. Consequently not even a king, and least of all one who had just come to the throne as the result of a revolution, and whose power and authority were as yet none too well established, could take too great liberties with matters so deeply rooted in and so vital to the folk-life of the nation. In the Northern Kingdom, just as well as in the Southern, the festival could not be celebrated at any chance time which the king might select in accordance with his politics or whim. It had to be celebrated in relation to the state of the crop, of the calendar season and of the planting of the seed of the new crop, the fructification of which in due time these very rites were designed to further. And, as Dalmann has shown conclusively,⁴⁴ these conditions, viz. the time of the ripening and harvesting of the crops, of the sowing of the seed and of the beginning of the rainy season, differ in the central and northern parts of Palestine not at all from the corresponding conditions in the south.⁴⁵

⁴³ Cf. "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals."

⁴⁴ *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, I, 41.

⁴⁵ Refuting the altogether groundless assumption of Kittel (*Commentary* to the passage). This impossible assumption rests entirely upon Kittel's blind and unquestioning acceptance of the dating of the festival in these vv. as original and authentic. Unquestionably the sounder scholarly procedure is to question the dating here, particularly when it is attended by so many suspicious circumstances, rather than to posit an altogether arbitrary, imaginary and unsubstantiable hypothesis.

Furthermore, as we have seen,⁴⁶ from the oldest times and on down to the revision of Calendar III by Priestly theologians in the middle of the 4th century B.C., therefore still in the days of Jerobeam I, the Asif festival was celebrated upon the last seven days of the old year and was followed immediately, upon the very next day, by the New Year's Day. But this New Year's Day was also the day of the fall equinox, and the performance of the significant rites associated with the fall equinox⁴⁷ constituted, in practice at least, if not likewise in theory, the culmination of the celebration of the entire eight days festal period. And, of course, the fall equinox fell in the Northern Kingdom upon precisely the same day as in the Southern Kingdom.

All these considerations establish beyond the slightest possibility of doubt that the implication, if not the direct statement, in these vv. that Jerobeam deliberately changed the date of the celebration of the Sukkot festival for the Northern Kingdom, and set it precisely one month later than the moment of its celebration in the Southern Kingdom, is altogether incorrect and impossible, that even with the best will in the world Jerobeam could not possibly have carried out such a project successfully, and that, furthermore, to have done so would have defeated his very ends and frustrated his political program not a little.

This conclusion finds final and absolute confirmation in the realization that the Sukkot festival did not come to be celebrated from the 15th of the seventh month on, the date here given, until the introduction of Calendar III by Priestly writers at the end of the 5th century B.C. This dating is altogether inappropriate and impossible for the time of Jerobeam I. Either then we must assume that this entire narrative here is quite late, the work of Priestly writers or editors living later than the revision of Calendar III in the middle of the 4th century B.C., or else that the dating here, or at least that portion thereof

⁴⁶ "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 22-58; "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," 72-108.

⁴⁷ "The Gates of Righteousness."

which makes mention of the 15th of the month, must be the work of late Priestly interpolators. Between these two alternatives there can be no question whatever that the latter is correct.

Accordingly we must set down the words *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom laḥodeš in v. 32 and *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom in v. 33 as late Priestly interpolations.⁴⁸ They represent the culmination of the attempt to represent the sin of Jerobeam I as his having arrogantly changed the date of the festival from that day which had been instituted by Yahweh Himself to a day precisely one month later arbitrarily selected by himself. But since, as we have just seen, this could not possibly have been the procedure of Jerobeam, we must set down, not only these words, but also the little clause, 'ašer bada' milibbo, in v. 33,⁴⁹ as a late editorial interpolation.

Finally, the repetition of *waya'as ḥag lib^ene Yisra'el* in v. 33b,

⁴⁸ This conclusion finds significant confirmation in the fact that the present reading, *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom baḥodeš in v. 33 is altogether contrary to Hebrew idiom. The proper expression would have been *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom laḥodeš. This form of expression, with *ḥaḥodeš* governed by the preposition *l*, is regularly employed throughout the biblical writings from the earliest to the latest. The form which we have here, with *haḥodeš* governed by the preposition *b*, occurs elsewhere in biblical literature only in Num. 9.3 and Ezra 10.9, both very late, and apparently also in Ezek. 45.20 and 2 Chron. 3.2. These last two instances are, however, uncertain, since unquestionably both vv. are corrupt. All this suggests that the concatenation, *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom baḥodeš *haš^emini* in v. 33, while probably not corrupt, is the result of a clumsy editorial interpolation of the words *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom before *baḥodeš* in an older and probably an original clause, *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḥ 'ašer 'asah b^ebet'el baḥodeš haš^emini*.

⁴⁹ Though obviously, as the clumsiness of the present phrase *baḥ^amiššah* 'asar yom baḥodeš (see preceding note) shows unmistakably, as an interpolation not quite as late as the two phrases giving the date of the month. Apparently this process of the editorial revision of these vv. was gradual and cumulative, and one fairly early stage affirmed merely that Jerobeam arbitrarily transferred the celebration of the festival from the seventh to the eighth month, without, however, venturing to fix a precise date in the eighth month for the celebration. This interpolation might well have come from the Deuteronomic editors and be earlier than the promulgation of Pg in 411 B.C., since in this period Calendar II was in vogue, with Sukkot celebrated in the seventh month.

after the already quite sufficient *waya'as Yarob'am haḡ* in v. 32a, suggests that the clause in v. 33b is also an editorial interpolation.

Granting then the late, editorial character of these phrases and recognizing also the redundancy of the threefold repetition in these two vv. of the clause, *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ*, with all the attendant words, it follows that the original narrative here consisted of the simple, direct and perfectly comprehensible statement, *waya'as Yarob'am haḡ baḡodeš haš^emini keḡaḡ 'ašer biyhudah waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ 'ašer 'asah b^ebet 'el l^eḡaḡtir*.⁵⁰

One difficulty seems, however, still to remain in this original text, viz. the statement that Jerobeam celebrated his festival at Bethel in the eighth month. This would apparently justify the charge of the late interpolators that he arbitrarily transferred the celebration of the festival from the seventh to the eighth month, "a month which he devised out of his own mind." Unquestionably it was just this statement of the original narrative, that Jerobeam celebrated his festival at Bethel in the eighth month, which gave rise to the charge of the late interpolators that he had arbitrarily changed the date of the festival, and that just therein his sin lay. Actually, however, no difficulty whatever exists here, but the statement of the original narrative that Jerobeam celebrated his festival at Bethel in the eighth month is correct beyond all doubt.

⁵⁰ The awkwardness and confused thought of the long clause, beginning *ken 'asah* in v. 32aγ and continuing through *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ* in v. 33aa, are further indications of editorial handiwork here. Whereas, as we shall soon see, in the original narrative *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ l^eḡaḡtir* can mean only "and he went up upon the altar in order to offer incense" (for the priest ascending the altar cf. Ex. 20.26), these editorial interpolators have obviously interpreted it in its secondary meaning, "to offer sacrifice." It is to *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ* in v. 32, with this incorrect, secondary meaning, that the following, interpolated clause, *ken 'asah b^ebet 'el l^ezabbeaḡ la^aḡalim 'ašer 'asah*, refers. The secondary, editorial character of v. 32b may be inferred from the fact that it refers back to and unnecessarily repeats what has already been adequately stated in its proper, logical place, in v. 31b, and in so doing disturbs the continuity of the original narrative to such an extent that the repetition of *waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ* at the beginning of v. 32 became unavoidable. Similarly in v. 32b the repetition of *waya'as haḡ lib^ene yisra'el waya'al 'al hamizbeaḡ* was necessitated by the interpolation of *baḡodeš haš^emini baḡodeš 'ašer bada' milibbo*.

We have seen that Calendar I was the official calendar of both the Northern and the Southern Kingdoms until the introduction of Calendar II at the time of the Deuteronomistic Reformation.⁵¹ In the time of Jeroboam I, just as in that of Uzziah, as we have seen, Calendar I alone was known. According to Calendar I the Asif festival was celebrated upon the last seven days of the year, the last seven days of the month, Etanim. The New Year's Day, following immediately upon the conclusion of the Asif festival proper, the first day in the new year, was celebrated upon the 1st of the month, Bul. Obviously therefore the entire festal period of eight days began in one month and was concluded in the next month, upon the first day thereof. In equating the months of Calendar I, bearing their old, West-Semitic names, with the months of Calendar II, designated by number alone, Deuteronomistic writers regularly equated Etanim with the seventh month and Bul with the eighth month.⁵² Unquestionably the original narrative, or perhaps better the source upon which it was based, told that Jeroboam celebrated his festival at Bethel in the month Bul, just as it was celebrated in Judah; in other words, it corresponded exactly to the festival celebrated in Judah, i. e., of course, in the Temple at Jerusalem, not only in the manner of celebration, but likewise in the time thereof, precisely the procedure which we would expect of Jeroboam if his purpose, or even merely a part thereof, was to influence his people to no longer go up to Jerusalem for the celebration of the great

⁵¹ Above, p. 10.

⁵² Cf. 1 Ki. 6.38; 8.2 and "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 67-71. Actually this is only a rough and inexact equation. We know that under the conditions of Calendar II the New Year's Day fell upon VII/10. Accordingly VII/10 of Calendar II must have been equivalent to the 1st of Bul of Calendar I. Actually therefore, speaking roughly, the month, Etanim, of Calendar I was equivalent to the last two thirds of the sixth month and the first third of the seventh month of Calendar II, while the month, Bul, of Calendar I was equivalent to the last two thirds of the seventh month and the first third of the eighth month of Calendar II. However, the equation of Etanim with the seventh month and of Bul with the eighth month of Calendar II was sufficiently exact to be used by late Deuteronomistic editors with convenience at least.

festival.⁵³ Then the Deuteronomic compilers of Ki., following their regular procedure, substituted for the original month name, Bul, their customary equation, "the eighth month." In this simple and easily comprehensible manner the present statement came about, that Jerobeam celebrated his festival at Bethel, the festival during the celebration of which he himself ascended the altar in order to offer incense, in the eighth month.

Definite confirmation of this conclusion may be seen in the statement of 1 Ki. 8.2, that Solomon assembled the people for the celebration of the *ḥag*, i. e. the Asif festival, at the dedication of his new Temple in the month, Etanim, i. e. the seventh month, coupled with the statement of 1 Ki. 6.38, that the Temple was actually completed in the month, Bul, i. e. the eighth month. According to 1 Ki. 8 the dedication exercises continued throughout the entire eight days festal period, and, according to v. 66, reached their culmination, followed by the dismissal of the people to their homes, upon the eighth day. This must have been the 1st of the month Bul, just as 1 Ki. 6.38 implies.⁵⁴ Obviously therefore, both Solomon and Jerobeam

⁵³ In all likelihood, however, this purpose, which vv. 26-28 ascribe to Jerobeam, was not present in his mind at all, for the evidence is strong that throughout the entire pre-Deuteronomic period the people pilgrimed first of all to their own, near-by, local shrines, and secondarily to various important sanctuaries of more than local reputation, and from one of these to the next, during the eight-days festal period (cf. 1 Sam. 1.3; Amos 4.4-5). At the most therefore there would have been no particular significance in the fact that some of the people of the Northern Kingdom may have gone up to Jerusalem, and least of all any implication that it was improper or disloyal for them to go up thither. Nor would there have been any ground for legislation or royal enactment preventing them from doing so before the formulation of the Deuteronomic principle of the single, central sanctuary and the specific D1 legislation in Deut. 16.13-15, or even the D2 legislation in Deut. 16.16-17; Ex. 23.17; 34.23. Manifestly the judgment here passed upon Jerobeam is that of the Deuteronomic editors of Ki. and not at all that of the original source.

⁵⁴ Cf. "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 36-43. The expression, *kalah habayit*, "the Temple was finished," must imply the completion of the dedication exercises as well as of the actual work of construction; cf. *ibid.*, 69.

celebrated the festival at precisely the same moment of the year, and of Solomon, quite as well as of Jerobeam, might it have been said that he celebrated the festival, or at least the final and most important day thereof, in the eighth month.

This leads, in turn, to the natural conclusion that our narrative in the original source told, not merely of the general procedure of Jerobeam upon the annually recurring festival, although his procedure upon these occasions could have differed but little, if at all, from that which is recorded here, but rather upon the great dedication festival, the Asif-New Year's Day festival, at which, precisely as Solomon had done before him in Jerusalem, he celebrated the dedication of his new, national sanctuary at Bethel. Unquestionably this was the import of the original narrative.⁵⁵

Moreover, the statement of the original narrative that Jerobeam celebrated his festival in the eighth month, can refer, of course, only to the last day thereof, the great, culminating day, the New Year's Day. And this in turn, makes clear the full import of the statement that the king ascended the altar in order to offer incense. Precisely this was, as we have seen, the ceremony which was performed by Uzziah upon the very same occasion, the celebration of the New Year's Day. The specific ceremony in question must have been the entrance of the king,

⁵⁵ This gives us then another instance of a temple-dedication upon the New Year's Day; cf. "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 44-58. Not improbably the original narrative gave a full and detailed account of the dedication exercises, an account which probably paralleled closely both in general content and extent the original of the present narrative of the dedication of Solomon's Temple in 1 Ki. 8. Of this original narrative of the dedication of Jerobeam's temple the Deuteronomic editors of Ki. made the barest possible digest and reinterpreted this in their characteristic manner and from the standpoint of their basic principle of the single, central sanctuary in order to represent Jerobeam, to them the arch-sinner of the Northern Kingdom (cf. 1 Ki. 15.30,34; 16.2,26; 22.53; 2 Ki. 3.3; 10.29 and *passim*) as having committed a paramount sin in venturing to erect a sanctuary at Bethel and in installing therein non-levites as priests. To this record of transgression of this arch-sinner later D, and then still further P, writers added a new, and, of course, an altogether unjustified, charge that he had arbitrarily changed the date of the festival from that appointed by Yahweh to a date of his own devising, exactly one month later; cf. above, note 49.

in his capacity of chief priest of the nation,⁵⁶ into the presence of the Deity, within his new sanctuary, with the burning censer in his hand, the performance there of the established rites, and his coming forth therefrom to perform the ensuing expiatory rites at the incense altar. In every way the occasion and the scene are precisely the same as those which we have established for the Uzziah incident.

And still one other historical incident recorded in biblical literature parallels these two scenes almost exactly and adds its share of evidence to the chain which we have constructed thus far. 1 Ki. 8 gives the account of the dedication of Solomon's Temple. As is recognized by practically all modern biblical scholars, the present text of this very long chapter has been built up from what was no doubt a simple nucleus through successive editorial accretions, some of them comparatively late. The greater portion of these accretions are of Deuteronomic authorship. But, as I have shown elsewhere⁵⁷ through careful analysis, the present text of vv. 3b-11 has been radically recast from its original form and reinterpreted, not by Deuteronomic, but by late Priestly editors. Moreover, it is clear that they performed this task, not because of mere editorial urge, but for reasons much more positive and compelling. Something must have stood here in the original narrative to which they took strong exception and which therefore they sought to suppress. It is not at all difficult to determine precisely what this was. The persistent use of the ancient term, *d'ebir*, in vv. 6-8, a term which was never used normally by Priestly writers, suggests that what was suppressed here was the account of some particular rite of the entire dedication ceremony which centered about this particular portion of the sanctuary.

We know that the dedication ceremonies of the new Temple continued through the seven days of the Asif festival, during the last seven days of the month, Etanim, and reached their climax upon the eighth day, the New Year's Day, upon the 1st

⁵⁶ Cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood."

⁵⁷ "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 46, note 44.

of the month, Bul.⁵⁸ Moreover, as is clear from vv. 62-66, upon this memorable occasion Solomon, in his capacity as king, functioned as the chief priest of the entire nation and thereby discharged the leading ceremonial role.⁵⁹ The portion of the original narrative which stood in the place of the present vv. 3b-11, and which was suppressed by these Priestly editors, must have told then of some important rite performed at or near the *d'bir*, in which Solomon, as chief priest, was the leading figure.

The continuation of the original narrative is found in v. 14, coupled with v. 22. There Solomon is standing before the altar of Yahweh. This was, however, not the large altar, upon which the animal sacrifices were offered up, which stood in the court in front of the Temple structure proper.⁶⁰ This bronze altar, which stood just before Yahweh, i. e. within the Temple building proper, therefore just in front of the *d'bir*, was too small to be used for animal sacrifice. It was rather the incense altar, the very same incense altar for which Ahaz substituted his new altar, made after the Damascus pattern.⁶¹ It was also the same incense altar at which, as we have seen, Uzziah had been performing the regular rites of the New Year's Day immediately after his coming forth from the presence of the Deity when the Temple was reft by the earthquake. Moreover, 1 Ki. 8.14 implies clearly that Solomon had been functioning at this incense altar with his face turned towards Yahweh, i. e. towards the *d'bir*, for it tells that at the proper moment in the ceremony he turned about and faced the people and blessed them.

This act of the chief priest blessing the people was undoubtedly a specific element of the ritual of the New Year's Day.⁶²

⁵⁸ Above, pp. 27 f. and "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," 36-43.

⁵⁹ Cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood."

⁶⁰ V. 64.

⁶¹ 2 Ki. 16.10-16.

⁶² Moreover, from the context both here and in Lev. 9.22-23 it may be inferred that this act of the blessing of the entire people by the chief ecclesiastic functionary, king or chief priest, was the concluding act in the ritual

As Lev. 9.23 indicates, it followed immediately, or almost immediately, upon the coming forth of the chief priest, whether the king, as in the pre-exilic period, or the high-priest in the late post-exilic period,⁶³ from standing in the presence of the Deity.

of the New Year's Day, preliminary to their dismissal to their homes. Dillmann has suggested that the so-called priestly blessing in Num. 6.24-26 was actually the formula recited upon this occasion. In this he is followed by Holzinger and Gray, but the hypothesis is rejected by Baentsch. To me the hypothesis seems to have very much to commend it, more even than its proponents could have imagined in their day. As they have stated, in Num. 6.22-27 the blessing stands entirely without connection with anything which precedes or follows. It is set in a P framework, but the blessing itself seems to have all the earmarks of earlier, pre-Priestly, and even pre-exilic origin. Deut. 10.8 and 21.5—both passages, however, RP interpolations into their present Deuteronomic setting—state that one of the regular and important functions of the priests was to bless the people, undoubtedly, in the light of the explicit directions of Num. 6.23, to pronounce this very blessing upon them. In the Temple, during the late-biblical and post-biblical periods of its existence, this priestly blessing was regularly recited by the priests in the daily morning service (*JE*, III, 244-246), but this is, of course, no indication whatever as to what the original function and place in the ritual of this priestly blessing may have been. Dillmann has suggested that originally the blessing may have stood in Lev. 9 following immediately upon v. 23. This suggestion has much to commend it. As I endeavor to show elsewhere (in an article entitled "The Fire upon the Altar," not yet quite completed), the text of Lev. 9.22-24 has been revised rather drastically by late P2 editors in order to obliterate certain details of the older New Year's Day ritual there recorded, to which, animated by their own ritual standards and practices, they took strong exception, on the ground that these were of non-Yahwistic, solar origin. If Dillmann's hypothesis be correct, then it is not at all improbable that it was just these P2 editors who removed the priestly blessing from its original position after Lev. 9.23 to its present position in Num. 6.22-27 and gave to it its present P2 framework.

Certainly the references in the blessing to Yahweh's face and its shining upon the people and bringing them good fortune (undoubtedly this, rather than "peace" specifically, is the meaning of *šalom* here) accords well with the coming of the *kēbōd Yahweh* into the Temple upon the New Year's Day in order to ensure the favor of the Deity for the people and their good fortune during the year just beginning. Perhaps too the threefold repetition of the name of Yahweh in the three sections of the blessing may be correlated with the "Holy, holy, holy is Yahweh" of the seraphim upon the New Year's Day, as recorded in Isa. 6.3.

⁶³ Cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood."

Beyond all question then that portion of the original narrative of Solomon's dedication of his new Temple, which stood originally where 1 Ki. 8.3b-11 now stands, and which late P editors revised so drastically, and of which they suppressed so large a part, must have told simply and directly of Solomon's entrance, with his censer in his hand, into the *d'ebir*, into the presence of the Deity, and then of his coming forth therefrom and his proceeding to the incense altar, just in front of the *d'ebir*, where, with his face towards the *d'ebir*, he performed the important rites of this specific moment in the official ritual of the day, and then, as the immediate continuation thereof, turned about and solemnly blessed the people.

Manifestly the ritual procedure of Solomon, Jerobeam I and Uzziah, and presumably also of Ahaz, as 2 Ki. 16.10-16 implies, was identically the same. In each instance the location was the same, the *d'ebir* and the incense altar just in front of it; the ceremony itself was the same, viz. the entrance of the king, in his capacity of chief priest of his nation, into the presence of the Deity, and his emergence therefrom; and the festival upon which the ceremony was performed was the New Year's Day. Two of the occasions in particular were likewise the dedication festivals of new temples.

Furthermore, we can easily understand just why the late P editors suppressed the original account of Solomon's functioning as chief priest at the dedication of his new Temple upon the New Year's Day and substituted in place of this their account of this portion of the ceremony, now contained in 1 Ki. 8.3b-11, in which the role of the priests and levites, i. e. the Aaronic priestly organization precisely as it appears in P and in Chron., is emphasized. The point of view is precisely that of the Chronicler's formulation of the Uzziah incident, with, however, the single difference, that Uzziah is represented as having committed a grievous sin in functioning as chief priest in this manner, whereas Solomon, a personality much dearer to the Chronicler than Uzziah, is protected and exonerated from all implication of sin by the complete suppression of that portion of the original narrative which told of his entrance into the presence of the Deity within the *d'ebir*, and instead the sub-

stitution for all this of the bald statement that the appropriate rites of this portion of the dedication exercises were performed by the Aaronic priesthood in the manner prescribed in the Mosaic Torah. But the very fact that the entire procedure of these late P editors is so readily comprehensible and their method of procedure so patent emphasizes anew the fact that the historical background of all three incidents, that of Solomon at the dedication of his Temple in Jerusalem, that of Jerobeam I, a generation later, at the dedication of his temple at Bethel, and that of Uzziah, a century and a half later, likewise in the Temple at Jerusalem, is identically the same.

Returning now to our first problem, there can no longer be the slightest doubt that the original account of Jerobeam's festival read exactly, or almost exactly, as we have reconstructed it, and that it recounted Jerobeam's celebration of the New Year's Day in his new temple at Bethel, the dedication ceremonies of this temple, and Jerobeam's functioning upon this momentous occasion as chief priest of the Northern Kingdom at his new national shrine. This narrative recorded simply and directly an event of more than passing historical significance. Quite manifestly it contained not the slightest implication that in erecting his new national shrine at Bethel Jerobeam had done anything sinful or reprehensible or in any way displeasing to Yahweh. This implication of sinfulness and of Yahweh's displeasure and punishment of Jerobeam is entirely the work of Deuteronomic writers who, quite characteristically, evaluated the entire incident from their own basic principle of the single, central sanctuary and condemned therefore the erection of the new national shrine at Bethel as the arch-sin. And then, still later, as we have seen, late P editors superimposed upon the already Deuteronomically recast narrative their own condemnation of Jerobeam for having, as they mistakenly imagined, changed the date of celebration of the *Ĥag*, of the Sukkot festival as they now called it, from the period in the seventh month at which, according to their calendar system, they maintained, the Deity Himself had set it. The literary evolution and the full historical import of the entire narrative in its present form are now clearly apparent.

III

THE DATE OF AMOS

It follows therefore that the entire narrative in 1 Ki. 13, which recounts Yahweh's displeasure with Jerobeam and his punishment of the arrogant and sinful king, can not be a part of the original, historical record, but must be a secondary composition by Deuteronomic writers.⁶⁴ Actually the chapter is not at all a literary unit. The story of the death of the anonymous prophet from Judah through the machinations of the old prophet of Bethel has no integral connection with the main narrative, that of the coming of the anonymous prophet from Judah in order to announce the doom of the altar of Jerobeam's sanctuary at Bethel, and is beyond all doubt a secondary expansion of this primary narrative.⁶⁵

Furthermore, within vv. 1-10, vv. 2a β -3a+5b are certainly secondary. They give an entirely new and false interpretation to the main narrative. That told simply that an anonymous prophet came from Judah to Bethel to announce upon the great festal day, when the king himself was functioning as chief priest in the dedication exercises of his new national shrine and at the very climax of the ceremonies, the destruction of the altar at which the king was officiating. The king indignantly pointed his hand at the prophet, whereupon, through divine intervention, the hand became stiff and immovable. At the same moment the altar was split in twain, so that the ashes thereon were scattered. However, at the request of the king, and with the clearly implied acknowledgment by him of the power of Yahweh and of his own error, the prophet supplicated the Deity and the king's hand was restored to its normal condition. Such

⁶⁴ Note that nowhere in this portion of the narrative do we find the slightest suggestion that the sin of Jerobeam consisted in changing the date of the festival, nor do we find any trace whatever of P editorial revision. The only sin implied is the erection of the sanctuary and nothing more. Stylistically and theologically the chapter manifests only Deuteronomic handiwork; so also the various commentators.

⁶⁵ Notice that *'ahar hadabar hazeh* in v. 33 ignores the entire narrative in vv. 11-32 and refers back to the incident recounted in vv. 1-10.

was the original narrative proper in this chapter. The destruction of the altar at this very moment is an integral element thereof.

Manifestly therefore the interpretation which vv. 2a β -3a+5b put upon the entire narrative, viz. that this altar would eventually be desecrated by Josiah, some three hundred years later, and only then be put out of commission, and that the rending of the altar in twain at this moment was merely the sign of its eventual destruction and defilement by Josiah, already purposed by Yahweh, does not accord at all with the original narrative. In this the rending of the altar in twain was the primary incident, and the announcement of this impending divine visitation and its import was the true purpose of the coming of the anonymous prophet from Judah. As vv. 2a β -3a+5b reinterpret the original narrative, the immediate rending of the altar in twain is merely incidental to and the sign of the ultimate desecration of the altar three hundred years later. That vv. 2a β -3a+5b are an interpolation into the original narrative is beyond all question.

This conclusion is corroborated by the realization that these vv. must be correlated with 2 Ki. 23.15-20,⁶⁶ which recount the fulfillment of the prediction contained in these vv., viz. the destruction and defilement of this altar at Bethel by Josiah, and with this the slaughtering of the non-levitical priests of this and other Northern sanctuaries who, according to 1 Ki. 12.31, had been appointed to their sacred office by Jerobeam I at the time of the erection of his national shrine at Bethel. In 2 Ki. 23, vv. 15-20 are likewise obviously a late interpolation, since they disturb the immediate connection between vv. 1-14 and 21 ff. In other words, in both 1 Ki. 13 and 2 Ki. 23, both passages themselves of Deuteronomic authorship and dating from the early post-exilic period, we have interpolated passages, obviously of secondary, and therefore late, Deuteronomic authorship, which ascribe the destruction of the altar of the Northern national sanctuary at Bethel to Josiah as one of the projects of the Deuteronomic Reformation. The fact that in 2 Ki. 23

⁶⁶ Within this passage v. 10 is a very late interpolation and probably, despite the apparent gloss, *'ašer 'asu mal'ke yisra'el l'hak'is*, refers to 2 Ki. 17.29 ff.

vv. 15-20, which deal with the same theme as 1 Ki. 13.2a β -3a+5b, are a late interpolation confirms our conclusion that these vv. in 1 Ki. 13 are likewise a late interpolation.

This conclusion finds further corroboration in the simple consideration that the rending of the altar in twain just at the moment of its dedication would have in itself, in all likelihood, destroyed the altar completely, so that the prediction of a further and even more complete destruction three hundred years later would have been almost meaningless and supererogatory. The actual destruction of the altar at the moment of its dedication could scarcely have served as a sign that the altar was ultimately to be destroyed again by Josiah. With all these considerations before us, we need hesitate no longer in excluding vv. 2a β -3a+5b from the original narrative of 1 Ki. 13.1-11.

But the argument just advanced in the preceding paragraph leads to another and even more significant conclusion. The rending of the altar in twain, a rending so complete that the ashes upon the altar were scattered, would, as we have maintained, have destroyed the altar thoroughly. Certainly it would have rendered the altar unfit for ceremonial use until it could be rebuilt or repaired. At the very least it would have interrupted the ceremonies of dedication and have thrown the exercises themselves and likewise the throngs of worshipers in attendance upon this momentous occasion into utter confusion. Moreover, such an experience would undoubtedly have been interpreted by both king and people as a manifestation of Yahweh's displeasure with the procedure and with the new shrine, and would, in all likelihood, have eventuated in their giving up the project completely and renouncing forever the idea of a national shrine to Yahweh at Bethel. But no such circumstance is suggested throughout the entire narrative. Instead the actual implication is that after the king's hand has been healed by the intercession of the anonymous prophet, the dedication exercises proceed quite as if nothing untoward had happened and are conducted to a successful conclusion, with the added implication that Yahweh was pleased with His new national sanctuary. And certainly Bethel did become the chief national sanctuary and religious center of the Northern Kingdom, and continued as such even

after the downfall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C.⁶⁷ and, not improbably, even until the reign of Josiah and the Deuteronomistic Reformation.⁶⁸

These various considerations establish with certainty that the original narrative of 1 Ki. 13.1–11 can not record actual historical fact, can not be the reproduction, even though with more or less theological reinterpretation, of an older, presumably contemporaneous document, but that it must be instead entirely legendary or even fictitious, from beginning to end, in content as well as in form, the literary product of its early post-exilic Deuteronomistic authors. But this by no means precludes the possibility that there may be some actual historical reminiscence basic to the entire narrative. Wellhausen⁶⁹ suggested many years ago that the figure of the anonymous prophet who came from Judah to announce the destruction of the altar at Bethel was patterned after Amos, and that this Deuteronomistic narrative here preserves a distinct reminiscence of Amos' visit to Bethel. Wellhausen's suggestion indeed had much to commend it. Amos did come from Judah⁷⁰ and did apparently foresee, even if he did not announce, the actual destruction of the altar of the national sanctuary at Bethel, and this too during the reign of a Jeroboam, although it was actually Jeroboam II and not Jeroboam I. However, confusion in historical tradition between these two Northern kings of the same name would not be surprising. Certainly the hypothesis is attractive and merits far more consideration by present-day biblical scholars than it seems to have received.

Additional evidence of deep significance, of which, however, Wellhausen could not have been at all aware, confirms his hypothesis and even elevates it to the level of absolute certainty.

⁶⁷ Cf. 2 Ki. 17.28.

⁶⁸ There may accordingly be some reminiscence of historical truth in the statement of 1 Ki. 13.2aβ–3+5b and 2 Ki. 23.15–20 that it was Josiah who destroyed the sanctuary at Bethel finally and forever.

⁶⁹ *Die kleinen Propheten*,⁴ 244; Klostermann, *Samuel u. Könige*, 349; Cheyne, *EB*, I, 148; Benziger, *Könige*, 91; Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, cxxiv.

⁷⁰ Despite the far-fetched and gratuitous hypothesis of Hans Schmidt that Amos was a native of the North; cf. my "Amos Studies, I," *HUCA*, XI (1936), 66.

As we have seen, the narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11, linked with 1 Ki. 12.32-33 and interpreted as based upon a definite, even though somewhat confused, historical reminiscence, implies that the anonymous prophet from Judah delivered his message of denunciation and his prediction of the destruction of the altar upon the New Year's Day, the climax of the eight days period of celebration of the Asif-New Year's Day festival, before the vast throngs which had assembled for this important occasion at the great national sanctuary at Bethel. Furthermore, his prediction is that the altar will be rent in twain, and this so completely that the ashes, or, perhaps better, the coals, thereon will be scattered. This was to happen immediately, i. e. upon this very same day, the New Year's Day. The rending of the altar in twain in just this extreme manner is conceivable only as the result of an earthquake, and that too an earthquake of marked severity. Accordingly the implication of the narrative is that the anonymous prophet from Judah actually predicted the coming of an earthquake, an earthquake of unusual violence, and this too upon the New Year's Day, and the destruction of the altar of the Bethel sanctuary as the result of this earthquake.

Now we have already learned in the course of this study that, according to a historical tradition, so widely supported that its reliability can scarcely be questioned, the great earthquake in the days of Uzziah, an earthquake so violent that, according to the tradition, the Mount of Olives, east of Jerusalem, was split and its two parts moved asunder, and the Temple at Jerusalem was severely damaged, happened just upon the New Year's Day, and just at the moment when King Uzziah was functioning as chief priest at the incense altar in front of the *d'bir* of the sanctuary, from which he had just emerged, as the climactic rite of the ceremonial of the great day. The situation is precisely the same as that of Jerobeam I in the historical narrative in 1 Ki. 12.32-33, as we have reconstructed it. These considerations suggest in the first place that there must be some direct relationship between the two narratives of Jerobeam I and Uzziah, a relationship, however, which is not at all legendary, but instead is altogether historical in its main details. The relationship consists in this, that both events, the

dedication of his new, national sanctuary at Bethel by Jerobeam I, and the affliction of Uzziah with leprosy, the historical truth of which can not be questioned, transpired upon the same occasion, the celebration of the annual New Year's Day festival, and that upon both occasions the king in question functioned as chief priest, in accordance with the fixed institutions of that day, and therefore performed in particular the all-important rite of entrance into the *d'ebir*, into the presence of the Deity, and then, after coming forth therefrom, certain other closely integrated rites at the incense altar which stood just in front of the *d'ebir*. This much is common to the two narratives and to the two actual historical incidents which they record. But we may hardly presume that an earthquake of unusual violence happened upon both New Year's Days, and precisely at the same moment in the celebration of each day, just when the king was standing at the incense altar. Quite certainly the element of the great earthquake upon the New Year's Day in the supplementary narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11 was suggested by the role which the earthquake did undoubtedly play in the Uzziah incident.

However, we may carry the matter much further than this in the direction of absolute certainty. I have suggested,⁷¹ and later will endeavor to show, and entirely upon the basis of internal evidence, that the prophet Amos delivered, not a series of addresses or prophetic utterances, but one, single, closely unified address, that he delivered this at the Northern national sanctuary at Bethel, that he delivered it upon the great, solemn New Year's Day, and this likewise two years to the very day before the New Year's Day upon which the great earthquake in the days of Uzziah happened. He did not announce in the course of his address the destruction of the sanctuary and altar at Bethel through the earthquake which was to befall the land just two years later to the day. But when that earthquake had come, and the sanctuary at Bethel, together with its altar, had been laid in ruins, probably with a destruction more complete and devastating even than that of the Temple at Jerusalem, and with the loss of the lives of vast numbers of the great throng who had

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 107-130.

gathered to participate in the festival celebration at the national shrine, and when the people who survived the cataclysm had begun to speculate upon its implications as a manifestation of Yahweh's will toward and purpose for them, then some, perhaps many, of the people remembered that strange prophet from Judah who, two years before, at this very spot and upon this very same day, had announced the doom of the nation at Yahweh's hands because of its sins. Many of the people must have seen in this earthquake with its far-reaching destruction the literal and speedy fulfillment of the prophet's prediction of national doom. Others, less credulous of mind and of hardier and more impious spirit, ventured to remind their brethren that that prophet had made no mention whatever of any earthquake, but had instead announced the doom of the nation only at the hands of a conquering enemy, impliedly the Assyrian, whom Yahweh would send against them; actually therefore the prophet had not foreseen nor predicted this earthquake and its destruction, and therefore his message must not be taken too literally nor be applied to the present cataclysm, nor should too great faith be placed in him.

All this Amos, in his Judaeian home, heard and understood. And it impelled him to renewed and final prophetic action. That it might establish the truth and authority of his prophetic mission and message and reaffirm the unalterable purpose of Yahweh, and also no doubt that it might serve as a warning, if not to the already condemned and doomed Northern Kingdom, still at least to his own fellow-citizens of the Southern Kingdom, among whom the very same sins which he had condemned so scathingly for the Northern Kingdom, were beginning to manifest themselves to a disturbing degree, he wrote down from memory the address of denunciation which he had delivered two years to the day before the earthquake, and added to it an appendix of extreme significance in the light of the turn which events had taken. This appendix was entirely of a personal, even of a semi-biographical nature. In it he recounted first his encounter with Amaziah, the chief priest⁷² of the Bethel

⁷² For the exact implications of this title cf. "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood."

sanctuary, and his denunciation of him and prediction of his unhappy fate. Then he recounted in graphic, metrical form the four visions which had come to him, with steadily diminishing intervals between them, which apprised him, with gradually unfolding vision and comprehension, of Yahweh's selection of him to be His prophet, a prophet of a distinctly new type, differing altogether from the professional prophets whom alone Israel had known up to the present, and which brought to him with steadily increasing understanding and conviction the full message of national doom and destruction at the hands of a divinely sent, irresistible, pitiless and ravaging enemy, which he was commissioned to proclaim over the sinful nation, a commission which he was altogether powerless to resist. This message he had proclaimed loyally and unqualifiedly. And it was true that in it there was no word nor intimation whatever of this terrible earthquake.

Yet the people must not err in imagining that this earthquake, with all its cataclysmic consequences, was entirely unknown to or unforeseen by him. In his fifth and final vision, the concluding section of his entire, little book, he tells the people of this day following the earthquake, and in answer to the interpretation put upon his words by the doubters and scoffers among them, that they were completely in error in their contention that he had not foreseen nor predicted this earthquake, and that therefore his words were not to be taken too literally, nor was too much faith to be put in him and in his prophetic message, that instead, just after the conclusion of his address of denunciation and his encounter with Amaziah, as he was turning to depart from Bethel in accordance with Amaziah's command, a fifth vision had been vouchsafed to him:⁷³

I beheld Yahweh standing at the altar,

And He smote the pillar so that the threshold quaked;
And He said; I will visit (My punishment) upon the cult-
image of Bethel,

And the horns of the altar shall be broken off;

⁷³ Amos 9.1aα+3.14b-15aβα+9.1aβb+3.15bβ.

And I will smite both winter house and summer house
together,

And the houses of ivory shall be laid waste,

And the palaces of . . . shall perish,

And . . . I will crush them, with an earthquake I will
slaughter them,

And the rest of the people I will slay with the sword;

No fugitive among them shall escape,

Nor shall any last one among them rescue himself:
Declaration of Yahweh.

Yes he had foreseen the earthquake in all its destructive reality, so the prophet affirms; but, so the further implication is, he had not announced it at the time, since, on the one hand, Yahweh had not bidden him to announce this, as He had bidden him announce the message of general doom, and, on the other hand, Amaziah had forbidden him to ever predict or prophesy again at Bethel, and therefore it was only meet that the nation, as whose high religious authority Amaziah had sought to silence him, should meet this dread calamity without previous announcement and warning thereof. He had had full foreknowledge of the earthquake and of the very destruction of the altar at Bethel and of the entire sanctuary and of the fine houses and palaces throughout the land, with all the huge loss of life, the veritable slaughter of the people which the vision had forecast. Therefore these impious scoffers were utterly mistaken in their assumption that he had not foreseen this earthquake, and that he was therefore an unauthorized and unreliable prophet, in whom no faith need be placed.

And still more were they in error in their assumption that, even granting that this earthquake was a dread manifestation of Yahweh's displeasure with them, there was nothing more to fear, that this was indeed the fulfillment of His wrath, and that, having been punished sufficiently, they might now confidently await a speedy restoration to His favor. This was only the beginning, only a small part of the destruction of the entire nation, which Yahweh purposed, and to announce which, and the manner of which, Yahweh had commissioned him as His

prophet. The enemy whom he had predicted would still come and overrun and conquer the land. Those who survived the earthquake Yahweh would yet slay with the sword; no fugitive among them would escape, nor would the very last one among them rescue himself; total destruction, even as he had announced at Yahweh's bidding, national annihilation, this was Israel's doom at Yahweh's hands.

Such was Amos' final message, formulated in answer to the turn of events and of national sentiment in reaction to the earthquake, the great earthquake in the days of Uzziah, the great earthquake on the New Year's Day, which had shaken Jerusalem and the Temple violently, but which had apparently wrought far greater damage at Bethel, damage which resulted in the rending of the altar in twain and the demolition of the sanctuary with appalling loss of life. It was indeed a manifestation of divine judgment upon the New Year's Day, the traditional Day of Judgment, surpassing by far Yahweh's smiting Uzziah with leprosy, a manifestation of divine judgment by means of the earthquake well calculated to make this particular New Year's Day the pattern of the ultimate Judgment Day, the awful Day of Yahweh, with an even greater earthquake, which would shake the entire universe, as one of its accompanying incidents.

With all these considerations and the logical conclusions from them before us, it is impossible to dissociate the figure of the prophet Amos, a Judaeen, from the destruction of the altar of the sanctuary at Bethel upon the New Year's Day by means of an earthquake, sent, as the people conceived it, by Yahweh as an act of judgment upon the Northern national shrine and the worship practiced there. The very language used by Amos in recounting his fifth vision, *ra'iti et Yahweh niššab 'al hamizbeaḥ*, is suggestive. It is almost identical word for word with the statement with regard to Jerobeam in 1 Ki. 13.1, that he was *'omed 'al hamizbeaḥ*, "standing at, or beside the altar." Unquestionably in both 1 Ki. 13.1 and in the prophetic vision it is the same altar which is referred to. It is not the great altar which, in West-Semitic sanctuaries of this type, stood out in the eastern courtyard, in front of the temple structure proper,

but the smaller altar, the incense altar, which stood within the temple building, just in front of the *dēbir*, the holy of holies of the sanctuary, in which upon this one great day at least, the deity of the particular sanctuary was thought to have taken his place. It was this incense altar at which Jerobeam I had officiated as chief priest on the New Year's Day of the dedication of his shrine; and it was this same incense altar the destruction of which, by means of the earthquake upon the New Year's Day, had been revealed to Amos two years to the very day before the actual destruction.

From this the full implication of Amos' fifth vision now becomes clearly apparent. It was the New Year's Day. Yahweh had entered into His sanctuary to pronounce judgment upon His people and to sentence them to their doom. From within the sanctuary He had witnessed the contest between His prophet and Amaziah, the chief priest of the sanctuary, and the defiance of the high-born and arrogant priest by the humble but divinely conscious prophet. Now, just as His prophet was turning to depart, his message fully delivered, his mission fulfilled in every respect, Yahweh Himself intervened. He took His stand at the incense altar, precisely as the king himself, or, as seems to have been the case in this particular instance, his surrogate, the chief priest of the sanctuary.⁷⁴ But now, in place of the chief

⁷⁴ The implication of Amos 7.10 is that on this particular New Year's Day Jerobeam II was not present himself, and therefore Amaziah performed the rites of the day in his stead. Perhaps we may even go so far as to surmise that Amos' address reached its climax with the announcement of the conquest of the nation by the divinely appointed enemy, the downfall of the house of Jerobeam and the exile of the nation in Am. 5.26-27 and 7.9 just as Amaziah advanced to the incense altar to perform the rites of such vital importance for the life and well-being of the people during the ensuing year. This would be indeed the most extreme dramatic situation conceivable, with Amos' message of the doom of the nation supplanting the ceremonies which were expected to secure and further its existence and prosperity. Also the background of just this setting would make the brief but decisive contest between Amos, the prophet of righteousness and doom, and Amaziah, the priest of corruption, class exploitation and mass oppression, all the more vivid and likewise all the more symbolic. That this hypothesis is not at all far-fetched but exceedingly probable is to be inferred from the tradition which we have already considered, that the earthquake smote the Temple

priest celebrating the rites, upon the proper performance of which the very existence and good fortune of the people for the ensuing year depended so completely, Amos beheld Yahweh Himself smiting the altar so that the threshold shook, and instead of the rites of national salvation and material security and prosperity he heard Yahweh's reaffirmation of the absolute doom of the nation and the sealing of this doom by Yahweh's announcement of the earthquake and the impending destruction of this very altar; and all this just at the performance of the climactic ceremony of the day. This was Yahweh's final judgment upon the sinful nation upon this great Judgment Day. The full background and meaning of Amos' fifth vision are unmistakable.

These considerations fix with remarkable exactness the date of Amos' prophecy.⁷⁵ His message was delivered at Bethel upon the New Year's Day, two years to the very day before the earthquake, the earthquake which marked the moment when Uzziah, officiating as chief priest in the Temple at Jerusalem, was afflicted with leprosy. This defiling condition disqualified Uzziah from further functioning as king. Accordingly this must have been the moment likewise when his son, Jotham, ascended the throne as regent in place of his father. Just here the biblical chronological data are confused, and the year of Jotham's ascension to the throne can not be determined with absolute certainty. However, the preponderance of evidence seems to point to 749 B.C. as the first year of Jotham's regency, and therefore as the year of the earthquake. And this in turn points to the New Year's Day, the day of the fall equinox, two years before, 751 B.C., as the date of Amos' address to the people at Bethel.

at Jerusalem just after sunrise, at the moment when Uzziah had advanced to the incense altar to perform the prescribed rites there. The earthquake must have struck the sanctuary at Bethel at the very same moment. And presumably in the sanctuary at Bethel these rites were performed in precisely the same manner and at the very same moment of the day as at Jerusalem. Therefore we may infer with reasonable certainty that the earthquake struck the Bethel sanctuary just after Amaziah too had come forth from the presence of the Deity and was standing at the incense altar.

⁷⁵ Cf. "Amos Studies, I," 107-130.

But we may go even further and fix almost the exact hour, and even minute, of Amos' utterance. For, as we have just seen, Amos must have beheld his fifth and final vision just at that moment in the ritual of the New Year's Day when the chief priest had come forth from standing in the presence of the Deity and had advanced to the near-by incense altar to perform the regular rites there. The entrance of the chief priest into the presence of the Deity was bound up with the coming of the *kēbod Yahweh*, the first rays of the rising sun upon the day of the fall equinox, the New Year's Day.⁷⁶ We can easily picture the scene. All through the night the people had been gathering in the eastern court of the temple, anxiously awaiting the rising of the sun.⁷⁷ Would the light really come this year? Would the sun rise for them this day bringing upon its wings healing of all their ills?⁷⁸ Would abundance and prosperity and divine favor be vouchsafed to them this year, or would famine and hunger and misfortune be their portion? Just before dawn the great, eastern gate of the temple was solemnly opened with appropriate ritual. The veil before the *dēbir* was drawn aside. The first rays of the rising sun shone through the open, eastern gate, straight down the long axis of the temple, into the *dēbir*; the *kēbod Yahweh* had come; the Deity was within His holy temple. The chief priest entered the *dēbir* and performed the

⁷⁶ "The Gates of Righteousness," 31-37.

⁷⁷ Cf. the parallel scene in the court of the Temple at Jerusalem during the ceremonies of the *Simḥat bet hašo'ebah* on the Sukkot festival, recorded in Sukkah, V, 4.

⁷⁸ Notice the full implication of the graphic picture presented in Mal. 3.19-20, that the light which ushers in the great Day of Yahweh, also a New Year's Day, as we have already suggested, comes for the wicked and impious as a consuming fire, while for the righteous and God-fearing the sun will rise truly (i. e. in its proper manner and nature, as a light- and life-giving body) with healing on its wings. (For the representation among the Semitic peoples of the sun with wings, i. e. as the winged disk, cf. Jastrow, *Bildermappe zur Religion Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, nos. 49, 50; Gressmann, *Alt-orientalische Bilder zum A. T.*, nos. 308-311, 333.) The continuation of v. 20, "and ye shall go forth and gambol as stalled calves," has, of course, as the basis of the figure the dances in the vineyards, also one of the details of the ritual of the ancient New Year's Day (cf. "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals").

appropriate rites there. Then he came forth and advanced to the incense altar in order to complete there in prescribed manner the ceremony upon the proper performance of which the life and fortune of the people during the year were thought to depend so largely. All this in the few moments before the dawn. Such must have been the established practice at that time in the Temple at Jerusalem as well as in the sanctuary at Bethel, and in all the great sanctuaries throughout at least the Western Semitic world. This must have been likewise the precise moment of the earthquake in 749 B.C.

But to go back two years to the incident at Bethel. All through the night the people must have been gathering there also in the great, eastern court of the temple. Eagerly, restlessly, anxiously they waited the coming of the light. What would the new year have in store for them, good or ill, divine favor or divine wrath and visitation? Then suddenly in the darkness, when it was thickest, just a short half hour before the expected coming of the dawn a voice arose, a strange voice from out the vast and milling throng, "Thus hath Yahweh said: For the three transgressions of Damascus, yea for four, I will not let him return."⁷⁹ The attention of the people was arrested. Here was one who was evidently a prophet, speaking in the name of Yahweh and proclaiming the doom of Israel's arch-enemies. This was fitting indeed, for was not the day just about to dawn the New Year's Day; and was not the New Year's Day likewise the Day of Yahweh, the day of Yahweh's conquest of His enemy nations and of Israel's triumph and glory? Perhaps this very New Year's Day would be the great Day of Yahweh for which the people had waited so confidently. This was truly a prophet of Yahweh speaking from out the darkness, and his message was certainly true.

But in a brief moment the tenor of the message, still coming through the darkness, changed completely: "Thus hath Yahweh said: For the three transgressions of Israel, yea for four, I will not let him return." And whereas a moment before there had

⁷⁹ This interpretation of *lo' 'asibennu* will be substantiated in "Amos Studies, IV."

been confidence and approval and exultation, now consternation seized the vast throng, consternation which grew steadily as the message unfolded. The very setting, weird and awesome, lent effect to the prophet's words.

And then just before the very moment of dawn, the dawn for which the people had waited so anxiously, which should usher in for them the new year, the New Year's Day which, in response to the prophet's first words, they had ventured to hope might be the long expected Day of Yahweh, came the despairing lament: "Woe unto you who yearn for the Day of Yahweh! What then is the Day of Yahweh unto you? Is not the Day of Yahweh darkness, and not light, yea thick darkness, with no brightness in it?"⁸⁰ With this consternation turned to despair. The light which they expected upon this festal day, which meant for them divine favor and fortune and salvation, would not come; instead there would be only persistent darkness, and in place of the expected triumph over the nation's traditional enemies, only conquest, devastation and exile at the hands of an irresistible enemy, whom Yahweh Himself would send against them. The doom of the nation had been pronounced by Yahweh through this unknown, invisible prophet.

Then came the dawn and the *k'bod Yahweh*, shining into the innermost recesses of the great sanctuary. Perhaps the spirits of the people revived somewhat, for after all, despite this prophet's words, the light had come. Now they could see him plainly and could discern, from his garb and manner perhaps, as, it may well be, they had already discerned from his way of speech, that he was not one of them, a stranger, from Judah. Perhaps too much faith should not be placed in him and his words; nevertheless his message was disquieting, and a feeling of foreboding still gripped the people. Just then Amaziah came forth from the *d'bir* and advanced to the incense altar, even as Amos was speaking his last words, "And I will arise against the house of Jerobeam with the sword, and Israel must go into exile."⁸¹ He caught these words and at the same time noticed the commotion

⁸⁰ 5.18-20 (abridged).

⁸¹ 7.9b (expanded).

among the people. In a glance he beheld the shepherd from Judah and comprehended the full situation. For a moment he interrupted the ceremony and first dispatched a messenger to the king to apprise him of the situation. Then he turned upon Amos with biting sarcasm, as he thought, well calculated to cheapen the prophet in the eyes of the assembled multitude and to dissipate their awe of the divine messenger and their manifest consternation at his words, and bade him be gone from Bethel, the royal sanctuary, and return to Judah, his shepherd home, where he might practice the role of seer and prophet to his heart's content.⁸²

But this was no ordinary, professional prophet, nor one to be easily intimidated or coerced. This was a prophet of an altogether new type, one with an authority and a message such as no prophet before him had enjoyed. To Amaziah's condescending sarcasm Amos replied with a direct and triumphant affirmation of his prophetic commission at the hands of Yahweh Himself, so that his authority surpassed that of even the chief priest, and the Deity's command to speak outweighed completely Amaziah's command to desist from speaking; and then, as evidence thereof, he denounced Amaziah to his face and, in the hearing of the assembled throng, announced the priest's personal fate. Then, his message now fully delivered, he prepared to depart, in formal compliance with Amaziah's command to return to his home country, Judah, and prophesy no more at Bethel. But his

⁸² It is quite probable that Amaziah was forbidden by the very character of the festal period from employing violence against Amos. In "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood" I have shown that in the pre-exilic and early post-exilic periods the eight days covering the Asif festival, the last seven days of the year, and the New Year's Day had something of a Saturnalian character. During them a substitute king functioned instead of the regular king, servants were free from the authority of their masters (for the same practice in ancient Babylonia cf. Gudea, Cylinder A, XII, 21-XIII, 13; Cylinder B, III, 5 ff.; XVII, 18 ff.; Statue E, V. 1), and in general freedom from authority and wide license seem to have been the order of the day. Under such conditions, we can readily imagine that Amos' denunciation of the nation would be regarded as an irresponsible utterance, which it was expedient to check, but which Amaziah dared not punish with undoubtedly otherwise customary ruthlessness.

prophetic mission was not yet quite fulfilled. At that very moment, just after sunrise, when the ceremony which ushered in the great day had just reached its climax, and while Amaziah was still standing at the incense altar, stunned no doubt by the message of personal doom, just spoken over him, and the divine source and authority of which he could not but sense, suddenly his fifth and final vision came to Amos. Amaziah faded completely from his view, and, whereas the people beheld only the chief priest, the prophet beheld Yahweh Himself standing at the altar and heard from His own lips the reaffirmation of the appointed doom of the people and the announcement of the earthquake and its destruction of the altar, soon to transpire as the forerunner of the general doom. And then the prophet departed. The content of this last vision he did not impart to the people, for had not Amaziah commanded him never more to speak at Bethel; nor had Yahweh bidden him make further revelation of divine purpose.

The entire incident transpired in one brief half hour, beginning shortly before dawn and concluding a few minutes after sunrise on the New Year's Day, the day of the fall equinox, 751 B.C. And two years later, to the day and the hour, the great earthquake transpired.

When we compare this entire incident with the narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11, their close relationship becomes obvious. In both we have the celebration of the New Year's Day at Bethel. In both the climax is reached when the chief officiant, in the narrative the king, in the actual, historical incident the priest acting as the surrogate of the king, is about to officiate at the incense altar, standing before the *d'bir*, the crowning rite of the complex ceremonial of the day. In both an anonymous prophet⁸³

⁸³ That Amos must have been absolutely unknown and anonymous to the people of the Northern Kingdom, assembled at Bethel, and to Amaziah as well, is almost self-understood, and may be inferred also from the fact that the priest could address him, not by his name, but only impersonally, *hozeh*, "seer" (7.12). The use of the name, Amos, in Amaziah's report to the king (7.10-11) does not disprove this conclusion, for obviously these vv. do not reproduce the exact wording of Amaziah's message to the king, which Amos could not possibly have known verbatim, but at the very most only what the prophet imagined that Amaziah might have reported to the king.

from Judah comes to the royal sanctuary. He denounces the officiating person, in the narrative the king and in the historical incident the priest, and likewise foresees or announces as Yahweh's purpose the destruction by means of an earthquake of the altar at which the officiant is standing at that very moment. All the essential details of the narrative, without a single exception, have their counterpart in the historical incident. True, in the narrative the king is Jerobeam I, while in the historical incident he is Jerobeam II; but the very fact that in both narrative and historical incident the king bears the same name constitutes more of an agreement between them than does the fact that they are the two different Jerobeams constitute a dissimilarity. It was just the confusion resulting from the fact that there were two kings of Israel by this same name which enabled the authors of the narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11 to link it with the name of Jerobeam I and with the old historical record of Jerobeam I's officiating as chief priest at his national sanctuary at Bethel on the New Year's Day when this sanctuary was dedicated. Unquestionably Wellhausen was correct, more so even than he himself surmised, in his suggestion that the Amos incident at Bethel was the historical basis upon which the narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11 was fashioned.

But if this be granted, as indeed it must, then the argument must work likewise in the reverse direction, and in the narrative in 1 Ki. 13.1-11 we must see final evidence which corroborates our interpretation of the life and message of Amos and our reconstruction of the dramatic scene at Bethel incidental to and following upon the deliverance of his message. But also in the linking of the narrative based upon the historical incident in the prophetic ministry of Amos with the figure of Jerobeam I, ministering as chief priest at the incense altar at Bethel upon the day of the earthquake, the New Year's Day, as we have seen, we must see additional evidence corroborating our reconstruction and interpretation of the actual, historical incident recorded in the original narrative in 1 Ki. 12.32-33, viz. Jerobeam's dedication of his new, royal sanctuary at Bethel, in precisely the same manner and upon the same festal occasion as Solomon had dedicated his royal sanctuary at Jerusalem some

thirty years before. And finally, in the correlation of the historical incident in the prophetic ministry of Amos with the earthquake in the reign of Uzziah, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, with Jerobeam's functioning as chief priest at the incense altar upon the New Year's Day at the dedication of his new, royal sanctuary at Bethel, and, in the second place, in the correlation of this latter incident with Uzziah's functioning as chief priest at the incense altar upon the New Year's Day in the Temple at Jerusalem, we have rounded out a circle of evidence in surprising and remarkable manner, a circle of evidence which, through its very completeness, gives final corroboration to the conclusions which have been reached, but which also leads on to new inquiries and conclusions.

In particular we have seen that in all three records, the incident of Uzziah, the incident and supplementary, legendary narrative of Jerobeam I, and the concluding incident of Amos' prophetic ministry at Bethel, the scene is precisely the same, the high officiant, whether king or chief priest, just come forth from standing in the presence of the Deity at the moment of sunrise, proceeding to the incense altar, just in front of the *d'bir*, and there performing certain rites, rites of extreme importance, upon which the very life and fortune of the people during the ensuing year were thought to depend. We may well ask, what were these particular rites. But the investigation of this new problem would lead us beyond the bounds of our present study and may therefore be deferred for another, more favorable occasion.

(To be continued.)

A CONTRIBUTION TO ISAIAH EXEGESIS

(Notes and Short Studies in Biblical Philology)

ISRAEL EITAN, ל"י

THE following lines present a number of observations, about a hundred, on the original text of Isaiah. Most of them have been collected from marginal notes occasionally jotted down in course of reading or teaching at different times. The selection was mostly confined to notes and remarks of a more concretely philological character.

Whenever a difficulty cannot be solved directly from the Bible itself as hitherto understood, help is naturally expected to come through comparative philology. Thus by far the major part of the present paper practically consists of attempts at filling gaps in biblical lexicography, including a number of *puns* in which one of the two meanings seems to have been overlooked so far (13.12, 30.6, 59.6, 60.14, etc.). The other observations, however, refer to various, more or less neglected, points of *archaic* grammar. A few general remarks concerning these latter will not be amiss.

About *vowel-receding* only just enough has been said for the understanding of the present instances (1.27, 3.17, 10.13, 28.16); while a more comprehensive paper, now in preparation, will deal with the more general aspects and bearings of this phonological anomaly.

As to the emphatic or asseverative *lamed* (10.32, 21.1, 44.14, etc.), its exegetic importance has been insisted upon elsewhere. It is, however, most illuminating to further notice the frequency with which this particle so unexpectedly occurs in the Epic of Aleya and Mot,¹ discovered at Ras Shamra in 1930. Evidently the emphatic *lamed*, usually known to be mainly characteristic of Arabic although found also in Assyrian, was as familiar a gram-

¹ Barton, "A North Syrian Poem," in *JAOS*, LII, pp. 221-231; see, e. g. לחתן, לירפעים, לאמלך, ליהפך, לישר, respectively in col. I, 4, 22, 34, and col. VI, 28, 29.

matical element in West-Semitic, viz. old Canaanite or Phoenician, as it appears to be, e. g., in the Koran itself. There is thus no reason, when an initial *lamed* cannot without a bit of forcing be interpreted in the Bible as a preposition or sometimes as the Aramaizing accusative particle, why it should not be taken precisely for the above asseverative element.

The same Canaanite poem offers also a few examples of the energetic *nūn* after an imperfect *without* objective suffix.² This makes the eventual finding of similar cases in Hebrew, where they have not been hitherto identified, all the likelier, see to 28.3.

In fine, the *optative perfect* (e. g., 45.16, etc.) will certainly prove of wider exegetical bearing as the different parts of the Hebrew text of the Bible are more closely studied in the light of Comparative Grammar.

1.27: **בצִרְקָה וּשְׁבִיָּה**.—This participle is misvocalized for a more ancient reading **וְשָׁבִיָּה** which had resulted from the original **וְיִשְׁבִּיָּה**. The latter result was due to a characteristic³ tendency frequently exhibited by *yod*—as well as by the other half-consonants, *alef* and *waw*,—to yield its own vowel to an immediately preceding *vowelless* consonant, the vowel thus receding to occupy the position of the *šewa*, whether quiescent or mobile, while the half-consonant generally drops out altogether.

In the same way **וּשְׁבִיָּה בְּבֵיתָהּ**, Ps. 23.6, merely represents a slight misvocalization for an older, pre-Massoretic, reading **וְיִשְׁבִּיָּה** that had resulted from orig. **וְיִשְׁבִּיָּה** by the above process of vowel receding. Cf. Syr., Targ., Hie. et habitabo. Otherwise see, e. g., Gen. 3.16 **הָרִינוּךְ** for **הָרִינוּךְ** in Samaritan, etc.

3.17: **וְהָיָה פֶּתַח יְעָרָה**.—This noun, to be correctly vocalized **פֶּתַח**, represents likewise an older spelling—phonetic only—occasioned by above vowel receding for orig. **פֶּתַח**, from **פֶּתַח**. We thus obtain an appropriate parallel to **קָדַקְדָּק** of the first hemi-

² *Ibidem*, see **אֲשַׁבֵּן**, **וְנָחֵן**, **וְנָחֵן**, respectively in col. III, 18, 18, and col. VI, 17, 19.

³ See, e. g., my "Hebrew and Sem. Particles," *AJSL*, XLV, 141–2, footn. 5, and XLVI, 27, footn. 1; or my "Répétition de la Racine en Hébreu," *JPOS*, I, p. 181, footn. 2.

stich, as suggested by Stade and supported by comparison with Num. 24.17: *ומחץ פאתי מואב וקר קר (= קדקד) כל בני שח*, and with Jer. 48.45: *ותאכל פאת מואב וקדקד בני שאון*. As to other instances of vowel receding with dropping of *h* in pronunciation or also in writing, they are only too numerous. See, e. g., *מִמָּתִים < מָתִים*; *תוא* Isa. 51.20 < *תֹּא*; Deut. 14.5; *רים* Job 39.9 < *רֵאם*; 2 Sam. 22.40 < *ותֹאזְרִי*; Ps. 18.40, etc. The current rendering of *פתהן* as "secret parts," although pretty old, is philologically baseless.

3.20: *ובתי הנפש*.—It is rather astonishing, according to all translations, to find no mention of any kind of *neckwear* in the fashion list vv. 18–24. Now, there is no sufficient evidence for the usual renditions "corselets" or "perfume boxes." One would then better suggest for *בתי הנפש* the meaning of some kind of "collars," on the ground that *נפש* might here, as in no few other instances, be identical with Ass. *napištu* "neck." But, for this connotation, see the next paragraph.

5.14: *הרחיבה שואל נפש*.—Certain scholars, among others the Assyriologist Dhorme, have suggested that *נפש*, besides its usual meanings all derived from the basic connotation "breath" (of life), represents also a concrete noun designating a part of the body, viz. "throat, neck, gullet." Be it as it may with Ass. *napištu*,⁴ the assertion certainly holds good for Hebrew, and here we have one very illustrative instance. The nether-world is mythologically pictured as a dragon—"Sheol hath enlarged her *throat* and opened her *mouth* without measure." The parallelism is thus much more natural than with "enlarged her desire." For the correctness of the meaning, compare further *קאו מים* *עד צואר יגיע* with Isa. 8.8 and sequel, with Ps. 69.2 and context. See also Ps. 105.18 *כרול באה נפשו* "his *neck* was laid in iron," and further below Isa. 29.8.

7.6: *ונעלה ביהודה ונקיצנה ונבקענה אלינו*.—The usual interpretation of the latter two verbs can hardly be maintained here without a bit of forcing. On the other hand, the meanings both respectively convey in Arabic seem appropriately to meet the

⁴ See Muss-Arnolt, *Ass.-Eng.-Deutsches Handw.*, p. 711.

requirements of the context. Indeed, the verbal roots *qyḏ*, *qwḏ* and *nqḏ* have all the basic connotation of breaking, disrupting, destroying, undoing. Thus, נִקְצָנָה in view of the intrans. קָץ (see further to 7.16), would best represent a causative of قَاضٍ (r. *qyḏ*) — يَقْضِي “to be broken, split.” The Arabic Bible, Beyrouth 1887, translates somewhat similarly—*nuqawwiḏuhā*, from r. *qwḏ* “to destroy.”

Now נִבְקְעָנָה אֵלֵינוּ is rendered by LXX ἀποστρέφομεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς “we will turn *them* away to our side,” which fits in pretty well with the general idea of the context. This seems also to tally with Arab. *baqa‘a* “to go away” in the causative. The whole sentence, referring mainly to the *government* of Judah, could then be translated as follows, “Let us go up to Judah, and *break it up* and *make it go over* to our side and set up a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeel.” The objective of the two allied kings of Aram and Ephraim is not to properly conquer Judah but to force upon the country their anti-Assyrian policy by a change of government. The correction נִצְיָקָנָה suggested by Gesenius is unnecessary.

7.16: קָץ מִפְּנֵי שְׁנֵי מַלְכֵיהֶם.—Here, as in Ex. 1.12 and Nu. 22.3, קָץ מִפְּנֵי is synonymous with the phrase חַת מִפְּנֵי (or לִפְנֵי), and etymologically different from the verb קָץ ב . . . , a synonym of מָאס. In fact, our קָץ is to be identified with the above intransitive Arab. *qāḏa-yaqīdu* (middle *y*) “to be broken, split” of which Hebrew exhibits the figurative meaning. The verb חַת has undergone a quite similar semantic evolution.

8.10: דְּבַרְוּ דָּבָר.—In this passage, as well as in Ju. 19.30 דְּבַרְוּ and further below in Isa. 46.11, דְּבַר does not convey the usual and specifically Hebrew connotation “to speak.” It is to be construed in a more concretely active sense, viz. like the homonymous Arab. *dābbara* “to manage, arrange, settle” (an affair). Further דְּבַר does not mean precisely “a thing” nor “a word”; it idiomatically constitutes a mere *cognate accusative* needing no special translation.

⁵ See the Anglo-Jewish translation of *The Holy Scriptures* ed. by JPSA. ad locum; Philadelphia 1917.

10.13: יושבים.—ואוריד כאביר יושבים. means here lit. "seated ones, enthroned ones," i. e., princes, rulers,⁶ whom alone the present verb אוריד can properly fit. Compare Am. 1.5, 8, where יושב is parallel to חומך שבט.

Now, באביר has resulted from כאביר by vowel receding.

10.32: בנב לעמר.—This verb is not an infinitive,⁷ as generally construed. It represents an imperfect, just as the next verb ינפך, only combined with the *emphatic* particle⁸—Arab. *إِن*. "verily." Thus לעמר is contracted from לעמר by vowel receding. See above to 1.27.

11.1: ונצר משרשיו יפרה.—Perhaps this יפרה, here parallel with ... ויצא מ of the first hemistich, is really synonymous with it and to be compared with Eg.⁹ prj (or, pry) "to come out, come up, ascend, sprout." Comp. the ancient versions, ascendet, ἀναβήσεται (LXX). As, in general, the Heb. verb פרה seems only to represent a denominative from פרי, we should then have in the present case the archaic verb from which פרי "fruit" was derived first with the proper sense of "outcome." Comp. the similar semantic developments of synonyms like תבואה or יבול. If the above identification with Egyptian prove to be correct, it would also best fit in with Isa. 45.8, see there. A phrase like ... פרי פי (Prov. 12.14, 13.2, 18.20), e. g., would then properly be synonymous with ... מוצא פי. Deut. 8.3, and comparable with Eg.⁹ prw פרו נרא "speech."

11.13: קנאת אפרים וצוררי יהודה.—This verse, as the immediately preceding one, is built according to *cross-parallelism*. The point is essential for the correct interpretation of the text. Indeed, both above genitives are *objective*—all versions and translations to the contrary, esp. concerning the first—and to be rendered literally,

⁶ See my "Les Princes des Philistins," *RÉJ*, LXXXII (1926), pp. 226–7.

⁷ See Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, pp. 299–305; Oxford, 1881.

⁸ See my "La Part. Emph. 'la' dans la Bible," *RÉJ*, vol. LXXIV, pp. 1–17, more esp. pp. 15–16.

⁹ See Adolf Erman und Herman Grapow, *Aegypt. Handwörterbuch*, p. 54; Berlin 1921, Reuther & Reichard.

"the envy (felt by Judah) *towards* Ephraim, and they that harass Judah (among the Ephraimites)." Thus קנאה אפרים is merely a rhetorical form, *abstractum pro concreto*, for מקנאי אפרים—as explicitly borne out in the second hemistich by ויהודה לא יצר את אפרים, while יצררי יהודה יכרתו לא יקנא את יהודה admittedly explains יכרתו. Is it not also suggestive to compare the mild ויָסָר with regard to those "who envy Ephraim" with the energetic יָכַרְתִּי applied to those "that harass Judah."

11.14: ווע פו בכתף פלשתים ימה.—This couplet has never been clearly understood, and modern translations therefore do their best to remain non-committal. The whole verse, however, describes a military campaign *in the future* by the henceforward reunited forces of Judah and Ephraim for the purpose of subduing their notoriously hostile neighbors, and first of all naturally the Philistines. The verb ועפו "and they shall fly" is hardly admissible here with reference to the implied subject, Judah and Ephraim. Very likely, due to a graphical mistake of פ for כ, it represents an original ועכו, cf. Arab. عك (r. 'kk) "to assault."¹⁰ Such slight graphical errors would slip in all the more easily since they afford the copyist a natural opportunity for the displacing of a rare or obscure term by a familiar one.

Now בכתף—correctly vocalized in the absolute—is parallel to יחדו in the next couplet and conveys the same meaning as does post-biblical אחת בכתף,¹¹ lit. "with one shoulder"—with a united front, with united forces, concertedly. The parallelism is thus perfect: "And they shall *assault* concertedly the Philistines *on the west*; together shall they spoil the Children of the East."

13.3: צויתי למקדשי.—The construction is unusual, missing a complement to specify the order. Neither can the verb here mean "to order = Germ. *bestellen*, to appoint," unless we consider, with Ehrlich, this *lamed* of למקדשי as the Aramaizing accusative

¹⁰ Comp. also the cognate 'āka (r. עוקך) "to attack," but this is constructed with the prep. على *personae*.

¹¹ For references see Ben-Yehudah, *Thesaurus*, vol. V, p. 2560. See also Ehrlich, *Randgl.*, IV, 49.

particle. The poss. suffixes, however, in גְּבוּרֵי and עֲלֵי נְאוֹתֵי do not seem to speak of these as newly ordered, or appointed. Very likely then we should read צוֹתִי (or צִתִּי) in accordance with Arab. ṣawwata or ṣāta (r. צִית) "to emit a sound, utter a cry." The parallelism with קִרְאִי (גְּבוּרֵי) would thus be flawless.

13.12: אוֹקִיר אֲנוֹשׁ מִפֶּן וְאִדָּם מִכֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר.—Of course, אוֹקִיר has here the meaning of a causative from יָקַר "to be precious" (LXX), as interpreted by Kimḥi and Ehrlich in accordance with the attitude of the Medians further described in verse 17, "who shall *not regard* silver, and as for gold, they shall *not delight* in it." Stylistically, however, the interesting point about our verse lies in the fact that it exhibits one of those *puns* of which biblical writers are fond and which much later became notorious in Arabic literature. Indeed, אוֹפִיר very likely has here a double meaning. Besides the place name Ophir it is known to convey, it might also represent a good parallel to אוֹקִיר (=declarative, "I shall *consider precious*"). As a causative from יָפַר*, one could compare אוֹפִיר with Arab. wāffara "to save, reserve, keep from spending." Neither is it irrelevant to notice that this connotation, opposite to the classical Arabic here conveying the idea of "abundance," is characteristic precisely of the Syro-Palestinian dialect.

A similar double-meaning has been pointed out¹² in Ob. 6 נִחַפְשׁוּ עֲשׂוּ.

13.22: . . . וְעֵנָה אֵיִם.—The prevailing interpretation of this verb here follows, with Kimḥi, the Syriac, Vulgate and Targum (יִצְפִּין), construing it in the sense of "to cry, howl"—although nowhere else do we find this term applied to the voice of animals. Other commentators, however, preferring the LXX (κατοικήσουσι) and Rashi translate "(and jackals) *shall dwell*," as a parallel to וְשִׁכְנוּ in v. 21. This meaning is very probably the original one. But it is neither necessary to actually emend here, to וְשִׁכְנוּ—nor even to remove the accent to the penult by reading וְשִׁכְנוּ* from a

¹² Israel Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, p. 58; New York 1924, Columbia Univ. Press.

problematic verb עון* that would seem to be postulated by the noun מעון.

Indeed, our ענה is not to be compared with the common Arab. intens. gānnā "to sing," but to be exactly identified with the rather rare gāniya "to stay (in a place)" or—more precisely—"to inhabit *permanently*." Compare Qur'ān VII, 90, and see Zamakhsharī, *Les Colliers d'or*, p. 18: وخلت عنهم الديار كان : لم يغنوا "Their dwellings are empty as if they had never inhabited (them)" (ed. Barbier de Meynard, Paris 1876).

Curiously enough the same Hebrew verb ענה is further to be clearly traced in a contemporary of Isaiah's, viz. Hos. 2.17 וענתה שמה : "And she shall dwell there (as in the days of her youth)."

14.10: חליית כמונו.—The usual interpretation of this verb in the sense of "weakness," connecting it with חלה "to be sick," is forced. Ehrlich's first suggestion¹³ to derive it from חללי (חרב) is improper as a parallel to אלינו נמשלת uttered by "all the kings of the nations" (v. 9). His subsequent remark points in the right direction though the colorless emendation היית (*Randgl.*, III, 55) is unnecessary.

In fact, to one more or less familiar with Arabic speech a collation of passages like ours with והליתי והייתי ככל האדם, Ju. 16.17 (similarly vv. 7 and 11), and also with רעה חולה, Eccl. 5.12, can hardly fail to evoke the connection with Arab. ḥalā¹⁴ (r. خلو) "to be alone, remain alone," ḥallā "to let, leave alone." Our גם אתה חלית כמונו means "Thou also *hast been left alone* as we." In Ju. 16.17 read "then my strength will go from me and I shall *remain alone* (i. e. without it), and be like any other man," and similarly in vv. 7 and 11. As to above רעה חולה in Eccl. 5.12, it denotes "a *singular* evil," lit. that remains alone, apart, unique.

14.12: חולש על גוים.—Compare LXX כולש כל גוים, and render, "O *reaper* of all the nations!" We have thus a picturesque antithesis to the immediately preceding גדרעת לארץ "(How) art thou *cut*

¹³ מקרא כפשוטו, III, p. 30.

¹⁴ See my במקרא בינה in *Ševile Ḥaḥinuk*, vol. III, pp. 33–4 (New York, March, 1928).

down to the ground." For חולש, cf. both vernacular Arab. ḥálaš "to reap (with a sickle)" and classical ḥálasa "to snatch away, carry off"; and see the detailed study of this verb here and elsewhere in my *A Contribution to Bibl. Lexic.*, pp. 42-46.

14.19: ל בוש הרגים.—This is usually rendered as a noun, "in the *raiment* of slain." Others interpret it as a passive participle from the same root, figuratively construed as "covered with (slain)" or "among, *with*, together with (slain)." Compare, e. g., Targum חפי קטילין, or LXX μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων. This latter interpretation continues the contrast of נצר נתעב "an abominable offshoot" with the foregoing v. 18 in a more natural way than by putting the king of Babylon "in the *raiment* of slain." Perhaps, therefore, instead of forcing "in the company of slain"—through a figurative meaning—from "clothed with slain," we should better connect the present לבש with Arab. labīṭa¹⁵ "to abide, stay, tarry, linger." For the lack of a preposition after such an intransitive verb or participle¹⁶ (in the construct), cf. further יושב הכרובים Isa. 37.16.

As to אבני-בור, it may possibly represent בני-בור plus a *prosthetic alef*. This phrase would here apply to the "people of the Netherworld," as might be gathered from verse 14 where בור is parallel to Sheol. The same prosthetic *alef* before בני (in Arab. even in the sing. 'ibn) is perhaps to be identified also in the case of Gen. 49.24b ישראל (= אבני) and possibly in that of Job 5.23 חית הפלשתים which is parallel to חית השדה, cf. חית הפלשתים 2 Sam. 23.13.

The whole verse might then be rendered as follows, "But thou art cast away without a grave Like an abhorred offshoot, —*Lingering* with the slain, that are thrust through with the sword, That go down to the Shades (—*Netherworld people*), Like

¹⁵ E. g., Qur'ān 12, 42, فلبث في السجن بضع سنين. "So he lingered in prison for a few years"; or Mas'ūdī's *Golden Meadows* (see *Stories of the Califes*), خلبث ما شاء الله ثم اتى عمر "So he lingered for a certain time, then he came to Omar."

¹⁶ The original vocalization might have been here לקבש* as construct from לבש = labīṭa cf. שכן < שכן, וכן < וכן.

carcasses trodden under-foot." The phrase פגור מובס can very well be taken as a collective, cf. רב הפגור, Am. 8.3.

Finally, the whole passage from לבוש הרגים up to the end of this verse may constitute a later addition, while the first sentence—from ואתה up to נתעב inclusively—formed originally one verse with the Massoretic verse 18, viz. the second half of it.

15.4: חלצי מואב יריעו.—Read with LXX and the Syriac חלצי and compare 21.3 מלאו מחני חלחלה. Interpret יריעו from Arab. *rāga* (r. *rwg*) "to slant, turn this way and that," and render the whole sentence as follows—"Therefore the *loins* of Moab *tremble*." It represents a personification of Moab. Ehrlich's correction ינועו is unnecessary.

15.5: ברחו עדיצער עגלו שלישה.—Read בריחה עד-צער עגלת שלשה. "Her *officers fled, hurried* unto Zoar." Compare Jer. 48.34: מצער עד-חרנים עגלת שלשה, where the prepositions עד...מ make it still more probable that a verb עגלו is underlying the otherwise unexpected עגלת in both passages. For עגלו, cf. the very common Arab. *ʿagila* "to hasten," and the Aram. phrase ובזמן קריב בעגלא.

15.9: לפליטת מואב אריה ולשארית אדמה.—This admittedly hopeless crux seems to represent a climactic conclusion to the whole "burden of Moab." Very probably read אריר and אדמה, both initial *lamed*s representing the *accusative* particle, and translate accordingly, "Those who escape of Moab I shall cause to *wander restlessly*, and those who remain (of him—לשאריתו) I shall cause to *perish*." For אריר cf. Gen. 27.40 כאשר תריר and Arab. *rāda* (r. *rwd*) "go to and fro." As to אדמה cf. מואב נדמה (parallel to שדר) in the initial verse of the very chapter under discussion or 6.5 אוי-לי כי-נדמיתי, and—for the causative—Jer. 8.14 אלהינו הדמנו. See also Jer. 49.26 (=50.30) and 51.6.

17.6: בסעפיה פריה.—Perhaps we should read בסעפי הפארה taking פארה as a collective and comparing Isa. 10.33 מסעף פארה for the association of these two roots. Now, סעף would then connote a minor division, or twig, of פארה. For the construct in בסעפי cf. the parallel phrase בראש אמיר.

17.11: גֵּר קָצִיר בְּיוֹם נַחֲלָה.—This never was linguistically understood. However, גֵּר—as a predicate to the subject קָצִיר—might represent the perfect (perhaps in the fa'ila form) of a verb נָדַר to be interpreted from Eth. nadda or nadada, “arsit, incensus fuit.” As to נַחֲלָה it has nothing to do with either חָלָה “to be sick” or חָלָה “to inherit.” Obviously it is derived from a root נָחַל and thus related to Eth. neḥla “corruit, collapsus, dirutus, devastatus est.” Take קָצִיר as a collective and compare the foregoing נִשְׁעָר (before this read בְּיוֹם bayyōm) and זֶרַעַךְ. The whole might be then rendered literally—“The boughs were *consumed by fire* in a day of *destruction* and desperate pain.” This constitutes a contrast to the solicitous caretaking of the plants conveyed in the first hemistich by the terms תִּפְרִיחִי and תִּשְׁנֹשְׁנִי, whatever their precise meanings may be.

However, the perfect גֵּר so abruptly starting this sentence might eventually prove to have been intended in the *optative* mood, “*May the shoots (boughs) be consumed by fire in a day of destruction*”¹⁷ etc. The use of the optative perfect (resp. precative) is less rare in the Bible than generally assumed.¹⁷ Compare אָמֵן lit. “be it so” (=Fr. ainsi soit-il!), or אֲבָדוּ גּוֹיִם מֵאַרְצוֹ Ps. 10.16, “May the nations perish out of his land.”

17.13: וּדְרַף כִּמְץ (הָרִים) לִפְנֵי-רוּחַ.—A comparison with similar biblical passages shows כִּמְץ to be always in the absolute, suggesting here, too, as the original text דְּרַף כִּמְץ לִפְנֵי-רוּחַ. In view also of the parallel סוּפָה לִפְנֵי וּכְלוּלָה, the word הָרִים seems unnecessarily to burden the meter. One wonders whether this הָרִים does not mean “offal,” having been secondarily inserted here as a free gloss to מֵץ. Compare Arab. hárri “to fall off” (leaves, fruit).

18.4: כַּחַם צֶה עַל־אוֹר.—For this צֶה compare¹⁸ Arab. ḍihḥ “sun” or Eth. ḍahāy with the same meaning. As to אוֹר, it certainly connotes here “rain” or “dew” and, whatever its original vo-

¹⁷ See my “Hebrew and Semitic Particles,” *AJSL*, vol. XLVI, pp. 25–26.

¹⁸ See Ibn Janāḥ's *Kitāb al-Mustalḥiq*, in his *Opusculs et Traités* publ. by Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg, pp. 210–211; Paris 1880, Imprimerie Nationale.

calization, is to be etymologically identified with Arab. *ary*.¹⁹ So it is, indeed, construed here by Sa'adya, Ibn Janāḥ, and Ḳimḥi. While to Job 37.11 the same interpretation is applied by the Talmud²⁰ and Jonathan, not to mention the great majority of outstanding Hebrew commentators in the Middle-Ages.

The two parallel couplets of Isa. 18.4b both thus convey the pleasant effect of the heat of the sun, or sunshine, combined with freshness of rain or dew.

19.10: *והיו שחיתיה מדכאים*.—Read *שחיתיה* and compare Copt. *štit*. "weaver" (<Eg. *šht-ty*); see Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography*, pp. 14–15.

21.1: *לחלף* *לחלף*.—As the above *לעמד* 10.32, this verb, too, represents an imperfect in the 3rd person, combined with the *emphatic* lamed. For *vowel-receding* *לחלף* < *לחלף*, see footnotes 1 and 5. The subject, not specified, is the same as that implied in the following *ממדרב* *בא*—the enemy. Translate "As whirlwinds in the South, *he* sweeps on, *he* comes from the wilderness, etc."

21.2: *כל אנחתה השבתי*.—The current interpretation from the root *אנח*, "sighing," offers the opposite of what seems to be naturally required by the context where the enemies of Babylon are invited to attack her. Perhaps then we should read with *mappiq* *אנחתה* and compare with Arab. *naḥwat*²¹ "pride"— or preferably "courage" of the Syro-Pal. dialect—derived from *nāḥā* "to swell with pride." This would be a suitable characteristic of Babylon. The absolute state would be *אנחה*, i. e. *נחה** (< *נחה* by *vowel-receding*) plus prosthetic *א*.²²

¹⁹ See J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, p. 60 (to Is. 26.19 *אורור*); Leipzig 1893, Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

²⁰ Ta'an. 7b, *ואין אור אלא מטר*.

²¹ Cf. Ibn Hišām, *Life of Mohammed*: *ان الله قد اذهب عنكم نخوة الجاهلية*. "God took away from you the *pride* of the pagan age." See R. Brünnow's *Arabische Chrestomathie* (aus Prosaschriftstellern), p. 58, ll. 10–11; 3d ed. by A. Fischer, Berlin 1924.

²² Whether or not Eg. *nḥt* "strength" (also "glory") could be relevantly compared here presents a question which might eventually be decided upon from Egyptian philology. See Erman and Grapow, *Op. cit.*, p. 86.

21.5 צפה הצפית.—None of the several interpretations given of this phrase satisfies the requirements of the context unsophisticatedly. There can here be a question neither of “watchers” nor of “lighting the lamps,”²³ nor of “laying out carpets.” In the above description of a banquet in three short sentences of which the first (ערך השלחן) mentions “the setting (or “preparing”) of the table” while the third (אכול שחה) speaks of the “eating and drinking,” it is hardly admissible that the *guests* themselves would have been omitted in the middle.

Perhaps, therefore, we should connect here צפה with Arab. ṣáffa “to array, set in order,”²⁴ from which Mish. צפופים “crowded” is admittedly derived; then we might further explain צפית from Arab. ḡayf “guest.” The infinitive may have read here originally צפה (instead of צפוף) by analogy with the perfect paradigm צפתי, צפתה, etc., just as we have קבה Nu. 23.8 for the expected קב* or קבב*²⁵—under the influence of וקבתו *ibid.* v. 27.

As to the precise nominal formation underlying צפית—whether e. g. it represents a plural צפות* (or צפים) from צף* or צף* (or צף*)—this particular point can hardly be ascertained from the present condition of the MT. The only thing afforded here by a comparison of the consonantal text with Arabic is a very likely identification of the root (ציף) and the exact connotation of the vocable under discussion. In accordance with all the aforesaid, we might then translate as follows, “They arrange the table, they *array the guests*, they eat and drink” etc. Notice the synonymous character of צפף and צרך.

21.17: ושאַר מספר קשת.—Vocalize ושאַר as a verb and comp. 1 Sam. 16.11 עור שאַר הקטן. Now קשת is evidently used here, though somewhat freely, as a *collective* for “archers” or “bowmen” by *metonymy* (רומי קשת for קשת). Cf. רכב sometimes as “chariotry,” and for the meaning of מספר see 10.19. The whole verse is then

²³ See Gen. r. 63, 19 מורחא סדר הצפית סדר, followed by Rashi and the *English Transl.* of the JPSA. This is anyhow the most interesting of the old interpretations.

²⁴ Cf. of the Midrash rendition in the preceding footnote. Also etymologically identified by Ibn-Janāḥ (פירוש לכתבי הקדש), compiled by A. Z. Rabinovitz, p. 58; Tel Aviv, 5686).

²⁵ Torczyner, *ZDMG*, LXVI, 389.

to be divided into two parallel couplets as follows, "And there will remain few archers, the mighty men of Kedar shall be diminished."

22.17–18: מטלטלך טלטלה גבר.—Read with Duhm טלטל שמעו נא ה מ ר י ם and comp. the emphatic vocative in 20.10 or in 2 Ki. 9.5. Now מטלטל does not mean here exactly "to hurl" for which purpose הטיל would have been sufficient. The *palpel* form of verbs generally has an *iterative* character like צלצל, קלקל, פרפר, etc. Thus מטלטל would here connote rather "to shake (hither and thither)." With the infinitive for emphasis מטלטלך מטלטל may be rendered "(he) will shake thee violently." This connotation of מטלטל will appear still more certain from the next following verb.

Indeed, יעטר עטה corresponds here with Arab. 'aṭṭa (r. 'ṭṭ) "to fell a. o. (on the ground)."—After צנף יצנפך later analogy with טלטלה has redundantly introduced the word צנפה. But the verb צנף itself was always improperly construed. In fact, it corresponds here with Arab. ḏafana (r. ḏfn) "to kick."

Thus the three verbs—to shake, to fell (throw) on the ground, and to kick off—constitute the three successive moments of a simile graphically depicting the way in which the Lord will rid the country of the hated Shebna.

22.21: ואבנטך אחזקנו.—Here the verb is synonymous of "to gird," having its originally concrete meaning proper to Arab. ḥāzaqa "to bind a. o. with (a rope)." Thus the J.P.S.A. correctly translates "And I will bind him with thy girdle."

22.23: והיה לכסא כבוד לבית אביו.—"A throne of honor," as a metaphor here applied to a person, does not look natural. Perhaps this כסא, whatever the exact vocalization might first have been, corresponds here with Arab. kasā "glory" while כבוד merely represents a gloss to it. The text itself then reads naturally, "And he shall be for a glory to his father's house."

22.24: כלי הקטן . . .—As correctly observed by Ehrlich (*Randgl.* IV, 80), כל כבוד בית אביו is the subject to which הצאצאים והצפעות serve as appositives, the plural of ותלו being thus justified. Now

the direct object of this verb is the general phrase כל כלי הקטן, which is still being variously interpreted.

However, not only is the connotation of this phrase further specified by מכלי האגנות ועד כל-כלי הנבלים, all representing utensils, but כל כלי הקטן can be construed to mean literally "household vessels" by etymology as well. Indeed, our קטן is evidently to be connected with Arab. qāṭana "to reside in a place" and also "to serve a. o." This root seems well to combine the idea of the house or household with that of the service involved in it. Compare further Arab. qāṭin "inhabitant" and qaṭīn "resident slaves, servants, domestici" = Eth. qaṭīn (cf. Heb. יליר בית). Thus כל כלי הקטן is more or less synonymous with expressions like the common כלי בית, or כלי שרת, or Mish. כלי חשמיש.

The whole passage, as a simile of the great support and advantages Eliakim's high position will mean for his many relatives, could then be rendered as follows, "And all the *throng* of his father's house, the offspring and the issue, shall hang upon him (cf. יתר in v. 23) all *household vessels*, from . . . even to . . ." etc.

23.1: הילילו אניות תרשיש.—In view of נולה למו at the end of this sentence, הילילו should here be construed, with Ehrlich, in the *perfect*—"The ships of T. *howled*" etc. Now, in the sequel, read מִבֵּית, and compare, with Ben-Yehudah, Arab. mabit "shelter for the night,"²⁶ an equivalent of common Heb. קלון. True, מבית would then represent a *deverbal* noun, while the verb is supposed to be known only in Akkadian, Arabic and Aramaic (cf. דַּת Dan. 6.19). To lend מִבֵּית more substantial support from the Hebrew language itself, I may suggest that Ps. 104.17b most probably offered the verb in question. In harmony with the parallel יקננו צפרים שם, this hemistich must originally have read חסידה בראשם בָּהָה, instead of ברושים ביחה; for בראשם cf. LXX. Finally, after מבית read מְבוֹא as a *gloss* to it—from מְבוֹאוֹת ים Ez. 27.3 (also referring to Tyre).

Thus, speaking of ships, the nouns מבית, מְבוֹא and מעוז (הים) v. 4 are all synonyms for "harbor, haven."

²⁶ See Ben-Yehudah, *Thesaurus*, VI, p. 2723, footn. 1 to מבית.

23.6-7: ע ב ר ו תרשישה.—This might be construed as a parallel to הילילו ישבי אי. Compare עברו with Arab. 'abara "to shed tears," 'abir "tearful," 'abrat "tears." Of course, י ש ב י אי here refers to תרשישה which would likewise represent a vocative, the final ה being due to dittography from הילילו. Possibly we should read here too עברי בתרשיש as in v. 10, and translate "Shed tears, O (daughter of) Tarshish" etc.—עליזה seems to correspond with Arab. 'aliz "restless" as suggested by the parallel couplet and proposed by Ibn Janāh for קריה עליזה, 22.2, and והשכרתים למען יעלזו, Jer. 51.39. Moreover, perhaps the initial word (הואת) of verse 7 conceals a *verb* comparable to Arab. házi'a "to die suddenly" or házā "to depart, be off." We would then have an *archaic* perfect הָאָת (<*הָאָת>); cf. it with יקראת Isa. 7.14 or יעֶשֶׂת Lev. 25.21.

Now קדמתה is to be separated from the immediately preceding מימי קדם as an independent phrase (adv. accus.) equivalent to בקדמָתָה, lit. "in her antiquity."

23.10:—The rhythm seems to be disturbed by the two words ארצך כיאר which might have successively been inserted later. Thus כיאר is not rendered by the LXX. The first couplet may originally have read ע ב ר י בת תרשיש "Shed tears, O daughter of Tarshish!" See above to 23.6-7. The common interpretation of עברי would have entailed a supplementary gloss like ארצך to give an object to that verb.

23.11: קָצוּנִיה.—Is to be compared with מעון הים in v. 4 and שָׁדֵר מְצִיכֹן in v. 14. All are derived not from עוּן but from עִי = Ar. 'āda "to have recourse to a. o. from danger." The correct spelling of the word is then מְעוֹן = Ar. ma'ād "shelter, refuge." In the present chapter where the term refers to a shelter for ships, a sea shelter (cf. מעון הים), it can appropriately be rendered as "a harbor." As to the peculiar form of מעוֹנוֹיָה, it must not necessarily represent a textual mistake.²⁷ The nūn might possibly be a remnant of the *archaic plural* as in נָצְנִים Cant. 2.12 (<נָצָה> Isa. 18.5 and Gen. 40.10), קִמְשׁוֹנִים Prov. 24.31, מִמְרָא (<מִמְרָא> אֵלֶּה) "terebinth" etc.

²⁷ Kittel reads מעוֹנִיה, Ehrlich—מאֹנוֹיה.

24.11: ערבה כל שמחה.—This verb can be identified with Arab. *ġāraba* “to depart, go away” in good parallelism with the following נלה משוש etc. Rashi and Kimḥi’s metaphorical interpretation “to darken” from ערב שמש is improper, notwithstanding the ultimate correctness of the etymological connection.

25.1: עצות מרחוק אמונה.—Perhaps we have to read here עצות as a perfect from עוץ = יעץ. This form with *ō* before the perfect suffixes is found not only with geminate verbs where it is the rule (e. g. סבותי, חנתם etc.), but occasionally it occurs also with the hollow verbs in the *kal*, while it is regular only in the *nifal* and *hif'il*. Thus compare ריבוק Job 33.13, or ביחתי Dan. 9.2. This would satisfy the need for a verb in this couplet and supply some parallelism with the foregoing עשית פלא.

28.3: ברנלים תרמסנה.—Perhaps תרמסנה here represents but the *energetic* form of the singular תרמס; cf. the energetic *nūn* in Arabic. In Hebrew it is better known before suffixes (e. g. יצרנהו, etc.); however, comp. Ju. 5.26 תשלחנה ידה ליתר, and possibly Ex. 1.10 מלחמה כרת קרונה.

28.7: נבלעו מן היין.—This verb—probably a metathesis for נעלבו—corresponds here to Arab. *ʾingálaba*, a form common in the Syro-Palest. dialect. Thus render the whole, “They are overcome by wine.”

תעו מן השכר.—Here, too, the verb is different from the usual תעה “to err.” It is most likely derived from a geminate root (תעע) and related to Arab. ta“a (تع) “to be languid.”

28.16: מוסד מוסד.—Vocalize the first word מושב, like מוכר, מוכר. As to מוסד, it resulted from מוסד or מוסד by *vowel-receding*. The whole constitutes an idiomatic phrase by reduplication of the root²⁸ to emphasize the idea contained in the first vocable; cf. ישן נושן Lev. 26.10, or חכמים מקבצים Prov. 30.24. Our idiom means “a solid foundation,” as further specified by המאמין לא

²⁸ See my “La Répétition de la Racine en Hébreu,” *JPOS*, I, 171–186, more particularly p. 181 and footnote 2.

יחיש which is to be construed lit. "that *stands firm* unshakable." For המאמין cf. Job 39.24 לא יאמין, and interpret לא יחיש as an adverbial clause from Eth. 'ahōsa "to move, shake." (r. ḥws).

29.5: המון זריך.—This זריך, parallel to עריצים, seems to correspond with Arab. zawr or zūr "master, lord," in view especially of the hateful shade of meaning attaching to this root in kindred phrases like the Syro-Pal. biz-zūr "forcibly, by compulsion," šahādat zūr "perjury, false testimony," and zāwwar "to counterfeit," or Eg. zūr "threat, forgery." Even in classical Arabic zūr "falsehood, calumny, lie, idolatry, idol" is suggestive enough in connection with the above connotation "master, lord." Perhaps then the present identification holds good also for ארמון זרים 25.2 and שאון זרים 25.5 where the LXX might simply have *misread* זרים זרים. Possibly, however, the original vocalization was זר (= זור), in differentiation from the common זר "stranger."

29.8: וריקה נפשו.—Render "and his *throat* (or gullet) is empty." Comp. above to 5.14 הרחיבה שאול נפשה.

30.13: כפרץ נפל נבעה בחומה.—Read נבע and cf. Arab. nábaġa "to appear" (also "to spread," of an evil). This is a gloss to make more precise the particular meaning "to occur" conveyed here by נופל and rather rare in the Bible. For the semantic development comp. Arab. waqa'a "to fall" and, also, "to happen, take place," or waqi'at "event, occurrence, accident."

30.16: על סוס ננום—על כן תנוסון.—The general interpretation is pointless, besides the unlikelihood of those who—in spite of the prophet's warnings—do rely on the help of Egypt thus anticipating their own defeat. We certainly have here one of those *word-plays* of which the high style, prophetic or poetic, is so fond in the Bible. Indeed, the first נוס is identical with Arab. nāsa (r. nws) "to swing, dangle," while the second conveys the usual meaning "to flee." This gives the sentence a graphic expression making its humor more biting: "But ye said: 'No, for we will *swing* upon horses'; Therefore shall ye *flee*." Of course, the humorous strength of the pun can hardly be rendered by a translation

for the lack of a single verb able to fill both above semantic parts.

Incidentally let us remark here that the noun נֹס "standard, ensign, signal" and the verb הִתְנוֹסֵס will best be connected with the above נוֹס "to dangle, swing (resp. *wave*)," the first applying the *proper sense* to the object dangled or waved in order to attract attention from a distance, while the second (הִתְנוֹסֵס) is used either as a denominative of נֹס or, in general, in the *figurative* meaning of this verb—"to loom, be displayed or conspicuous." The root נוֹס* under which these two vocables are given in the Lexica is here irrelevant.

30.18: יָרוֹם לְרַחֲמֶכֶם.—This verb has already been identified²⁹ with Arab. *rāma* (r. *rwm*) "to desire eagerly, wish." In support of this construction the following remarks may not be amiss. Indeed, besides the fact that any emendation—whether יָרוֹם or יָקוֹם (Ehrlich)—would "interfere with the evident alliteration," the LXX ὑψωθήσεται (=will be *exalted*) already gives the reading of the MT. Second, the Arab. intensive *rāwwama* "to wait, tarry" shows the synonymous character of this root with חָכָה of the first couplet and, therefore, its fitness and likelihood to be employed in the parallel couplet. Thirdly the parallelism thus obtained is of the better literary quality, viz. not merely tautological but with a *climactic* nuance: "... The Lord *waits* that he may be gracious unto you, ... He *wishes* that He may have compassion upon you."

30.22: צָא ... וּטְמַאתֶם.—וּטְמַאתֶם has a *declarative* connotation "to pronounce (=declare) as טָמֵא," and similarly צָא הָאִמֵּר לוֹ means "Thou shalt *call it* filth," cf. צָאֵה.

31.4: אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא עָלָיו מִלֵּא רַעִים.—The verb has here the *proper* sense "to gather together," and is related to Arab. *qarā* (r. *qry*) "to collect (water)" and مَقْرَى "a basin." But for this meaning of קָרָא cf. my study on "The Crux in Prov. 27.16," *JQR*, XV, 420–422.

²⁹ See David Yellin in *Israel Abrahams Memorial Volume*, p. 456 (Vienna 1927).

32.6: ולבו יעשה און.—This verb is obviously identical with Arab. *gašiya* "to cover, conceal,"³⁰ and its biblical instances have been studied elsewhere.³¹ To them should be added Job 15.27b where ויעש is parallel to כסה and פימה "collops (of fat)" to חלב, the whole to be compared with ... על הכסלים Lev. 3.4 and *passim*.

32.14: בָּחַן.—In the whole Bible only here and in 23.13 בחיניו do we find this root employed to designate a kind of structure, evidently fortified or for military purposes. Perhaps comp. Eg. *bḥn-t* "pylon," *bḥn* "fortress, castle."³²

34.17: והוא הפיל להן גורל—וידו חלקתה להם בקו.—Read חלקה or archaic חלקת* (cf. 51.21 arch. שכרה = שכרה), no object suffix being required by parallelism, cf. הפיל. The direct object must here be בקו, a noun hitherto unknown in Hebrew. However, as a parallel to גורל and a component of a phrase חלקה בקו = גורל, it evidently represents a synonym of גורל "lot." Thus בקו is to be etymologically identified with Arab. باقوى *baqwā* "(something) that *outlasts*, *outlives*," from *bāqiya* "to remain, last, continue." It conveys here *personal* property, or a *gift to remain* one's own continuously = נחלה. This is further specified by the following נחלה עד עולם etc., the verb most probably referring to בקו (*בִּקְוִי <) which originally had a *feminine* ending, cf. the Arabic.

Apparently our בִּקְוִי = בָּקוּ which had resulted from original בִּקְוִי*—by *vowel receding*.

37.25: בכף פעמי.—In Phoenician פעם is the *common* equivalent for Heb. רגל. In Hebrew, however, פעם is employed in this concrete sense in higher or poetic style only, as here or in 26.6 פעמי דלים or in Cant. 7.2 פעמך בנעלים and in some idiomatic phrases.

³⁰ E. g., Qur'an 53, 16 اذ يغشى السدرة ما يغشى "when that covered the *sidra*-tree which covered it," i. e. hosts of adoring angels.

³¹ Israel Eitan, *A Contribution to Bibl. Lexicog.*, pp. 57–58 (N. Y. 1924, Columbia Univ. Press).

³² Erman and Grapow, *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

A quite similar mutual relationship between Hebrew and Phoenician is to be noticed concerning a number of other terms as, e. g., שׂאֵר "flesh," חֶרֶץ "gold."

39.8: אָמֶת (<אֶמֶת*)—Render "peace and security." Our אָמֶת is to be compared with the verbal noun Arab. 'amanat from 'amina "to be secure, in safety," and 'amn "security, safety, protection."

41.2-3: יִתֵּן לִפְנֵי ... מַלְכִּים יִרְדּוּ.—Verse 2 can be divided into three lines of which the third (beginning with יִתֵּן כַּעֲפָר) really constitutes the first line of verse 3. In both lines of v. 2 thus restored the subject—rhetorically implied by מִי—is, of course, the Lord. Vocalize then צַדִּיק as the direct object of הָעִיר and belonging, indeed, to the same couplet. The parallel couplet is יִקְרָאֵהוּ לְרִגְלוֹ before which מִי is to be understood, so that the object suff. of יִקְרָאֵהוּ refers to the same צַדִּיק(י), while לְרִגְלוֹ alludes to the subject. This לְרִגְלוֹ metaphorically means "into his presence, under his authority, or command."

In the second line יִתֵּן is to be vocalized as a causative geminate יִתֵּן and identified with Arab. 'atánna "to stunt," while in the parallel couplet the correct reading is יִרְדּוּ, from יִרְדּוּ "to subdue" (so also in 45.1), in accordance with Ps. 144.2 עֲמִיתָחִי הִרְוִיד. Thus יִתֵּן (r. tnn) "to stunt," besides good parallelism, certainly offers also better style—in view of the usual יִתֵּן starting the next line.

Now, v. 2c (=v. 3a) and the present verse 3 (=verse 3b) tell of the effect of the Lord's favor shown the conqueror (here called צַדִּיק). The latter, indeed, is here the subject, and we have to read יִרְדָּם and קִשְׁתָּם in accordance with the following חֲרָבָם and with the Septuagint.

41.9: וּמֵאֲצִילָהּ קִרְאָתִיךָ.—After הַחֹקֶתִיךָ in the first couplet, קִרְאָתִיךָ would present an anti-climax—according to the current interpretation from "to call." However, קִרְאָתִיךָ properly means here "I gathered thee." Comp. above to 31.4 מֵלֵא רַעִים and see JQR, XV, 420-422.

For מֵאֲצִילָהּ, parallel to מִקְצוֹת הָאָרֶץ, cf. Arab. waṣīlat "extensive country."

41.10, 23: וּנְשַׁחֲצָה, אֶל־חֹשֶׁת:—Both from a root שחע,³³ Arab. šṭ', synonym of ירא "to fear."

41.15: חֶרֶץ (חדש) בַּעַל פִּיפִּיּוֹת:—חֶרֶץ is a free gloss to חרוץ which was misconstrued as an adjective to מורג. In fact, חרוץ belongs to the *second couplet* as a synonym of and parallel to מורג "threshing-sledge," cf. 28.27 and Am. 1.3 בַּחֲרוֹצוֹת הַבְּרוּז.

41.17: אֲנִי ה' אֵעֲנֶם אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא אֶעֱזָבָם:—For the structure of this line where אֲנִי is to be supplied *before* אֱלֹהֵי by parallelism, compare Prov. 8.12 מִזְמוֹת אֲמַצָּא וְדַעַת עֲרַמָּה שְׁכַנְתִּי עֲרַמָּה וְדַעַת (אֲנִי) דַּעַת, where וְדַעַת is undoubtedly to be construed as דַּעַת (אֲנִי), instead of reading with LXX, Syr. and Targ. דַּעַת וּמִזְמוֹת.

41.20: . . . וְיִשְׁמְרוּ וְיִשְׁכִּילוּ יַחְדָּו כִּי . . . :—The usual interpretation of וְיִשְׁמְרוּ as abbreviated from וְיִשְׁמְרוּ לָב is only a last shift. Very probably we should read וְיִשְׁמוּ with a *shin* and construe it in the sense of the Mishnaic homonym—"to estimate, compute." Compare the Talmudic interpretation³⁴ to וְשֵׁם דְּרַךְ אֲרָאָנוּ בִישַׁע וְאֱלֹהִים, Ps. 50.23.

41.21: יִגִּשׁוּ (יִגְשׁוּ) קִרְבּוֹ רִיבְכֶם . . . הַגִּישׁוֹ עֲצֻמוֹתֵיכֶם:—In v. 22 יִגִּשׁוּ (יִגְשׁוּ) refer to these two nouns as their logical subjects. Thus רִיבְכֶם is evidently misvocalized for רִיבִיכֶם (orig. רִיבְכֶם) "your chiefs, lords." Comp. Mish. רַב "master" and esp. Arab. rabb "master, *Lord*," or rabbat "female *idol*." Similarly עֲצֻמוֹתֵיכֶם, rendered by Hieronymus *idola vestra*, might be interpreted naturally enough from Arab. عِظَمَاتُ الْقَوْمِ "the *chiefs* of the people." The original vocalization, too, was probably עֲצֻמוֹתֵיכֶם. Cheyne's correction עֲצֻבוֹתֵיכֶם is then not indispensable, since "lords" and "chiefs" can as easily designate "gods" and "idols." All the more so in view of the fact that the plural for "idols" referred to is always עֲצָבִים (not עֲצָבוֹת *).

³³ See Ehrlich, *Randgl.*, IV, p. 150; and my *A Contribution to Bibl. Lexicog.* p. 8. In Ehrlich's מקרא כפשוטו, III, 89, however, the old derivation from שחע had been preserved yet.

³⁴ See Mo'ed Ḳatan 5, bot. a and top b: וְשֵׁם אֲרוֹחוֹתָיו . . . אֵל תִּקְרִי וְשֵׁם . . . אל תִּקְרִי. Also Soṭa 5b and Leviticus r. ch. 9,3 דְּשִׁיִּים אֲרוֹחֵיהֶם Cf. LXX and Syr. with same reading (šām), though different interpretation.

41.25: ממזרח שמש יקרא בשמי.—Here יקרא בשמי presents an inverted parallel to העירותי ואת. This יקרא is a synonym of אחא, נלולכם, מובחותים, פנה, הלך, בא, to be compared with Arab. qārā (r. qrw) “to go, direct o. s. towards, follow” etc. Translate properly “From the rising of the sun he follows in My name.”

41.29: מפעיהם נסכיחם.—Apparently this מפעיהם represents some *concrete* noun as a parallel to נסכיחם “their molten images” (cf. פסלי ונסכי 48.5), thus recalling Ezek. 6.6 where נלולכם occupies a similar position right after מובחותים and הפניכם. A further collation with Jer. 3.16 לא יאמרו עוד ארון and with Ex. 32.35 עשו את העגל אשר עשה אהרן, where the first verb is doubtlessly different from the following common עשה, will show that in all the above instances we have to recognize a term of *worshipping*. This could be interpreted from the Arab. ḡašā (r. ḡšw) “to come to a. o., to come towards a. o.,”³⁵ in view of the Hebrew synonyms in analogous expressions, like הֵלַךְ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, or וְהָיוּ פִּנְיָם אֶל אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, שָׁעוּ עַל קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל.

This etymological identification will gain in likelihood by further considering the more particular—though very classical³⁷—connotation of the above Arabic verb as “to engage blindly (in an affair),” or “to give (oneself) up to.”³⁸ Thus in Jer. 3.16 and Ex. 32.35 our עשה would mean “to worship, revere.” As to מפעשה in our Isaiah verse and in Ezek. 6.6, it might just represent a nomen loci from the same verb, viz. “place of worship, shrine.”

44.8: ואל תךהו.—As synonym of the preceding תפחדו, this might be explained, in a figurative meaning, from Arab. wáriha “to be clumsy, awkward,”—here as effect of emotion.

³⁵ See Eitan, in *Ševile Hahinuk*, vol. II, no. 5, pp. 51–52.

³⁶ For other bibl. instances of this meaning, see my *A Contrib. to Bibl. Lex.*, pp. 56–7.

³⁷ Cf. Ibn Hishām, *Life of Mohammed*: وان غشيتم من ذلك شيئا فامرکم الى الله “if you *engage-blindly* in anything of that, then your matter is up to Allah.” See Brünnow’s *Arab. Chrestom.* (3d ed.) p. 44, l. 4.

³⁸ Cf. e. g., yaḡša’l-ḥurūb, Lane, p. 2261.

44.9: כלם תהו (יצרי פסל).—Vocalize תהו as a verb (r. תוה) and interpret from Arab. *tāha* rather in the sense proper to the Syro-Pal. dialect—"to be absent-minded"; cf. *tawahān* "absence of mind, bewilderment." See further יראו ובל ידעו.

44.11: יפחדו יבשו.—Since יפחדו does not seem appropriate here, perhaps read יחפרו. Compare 24.23 ובושה . . . וחפרה.

44.12: ובמקבות יצר הו.—Since מקבת denotes a *hammer*, esp. as a tool for driving in *nails* (or *pegs*), one would read here יצדה (with a *daleth*) as the intens. form of an intrans. יצר = Arab. *wāṣada* "to be fast, firm" or "to remain in (a place)." Translate then, "and *fasteneth* it with hammers." Apparently so also read the LXX *καὶ ἐν τεπέρω ἔσκησεν αὐτο* and "*fixes* it with an awl," only wrongly interpreting מקבת as an instrument directly boring holes, awl or gimlet (from נקב). In such a passage about the production of idols, some technical terms were bound to occur. See further.

44.13: יעשהו במקצעות.—This verb must be different from the common יעשהו following in the same verse. Apparently it conveys the specific action of the instrument mentioned herewith. Read וישעהו and cf. Syr. אשע (r. שעע) "to smooth," שעיע "smooth."³⁹ Translate "He *smootheeth* it with planes."

Similarly Ehrlich is very probably right in reading [ובמחוגה] יתאהו "he *marketh* it out," comparing Nu. 34.7 (also vv. 8 and 10).

44.14: לכרת-לו ארוים.—Read לקרת-לו as a perfect plus the *emphatic lamed*,⁴⁰ in accordance with LXX and the Vulgate.

44.20: לב הותל.—This הותל cannot be derived from the causative התל (r. tll) which is always constructed with the prep. ב. Nor can התלים Job 17.2. Very possibly both instances should be

³⁹ This interpretation I received orally from my revered late friend and colleague Ben-Yehudah, in Jerusalem, about thirteen years ago.

⁴⁰ *REJ*, LXXIV, p. 11.

explained from the Arab. root htr. Compare, e. g., hātara “to disorder the mind of a. o.” (old age, grief), hutra “insanity, disorder of mind,” or hitra “lie, nonsense, absurdity,” or hitra hātir “nonsense.” See also in the Eg. dial. hatar “to rave, be delirious.” Whether we should vocalize resp. הָחול and הַחולִים, or הוֹחַל and הוֹחִלִים, or here לֵב הוֹחַל “a foolish, *disordered* mind” and in Job הַחולִים “*disordered in mind*, dotards”—can hardly be made sure.

As for the best syntactic construction of Isa. 44.20a, see Ehrlich, *Randgl.* IV, pp. 162–3.

44.21b: לֹא תִנְשְׁנִי.—This is parallel to עֲבַד-לִי אַחַה, and would best be connected with Arab. nāsā (r. נָשָׂא) “to give up” (a work), esp. keeping in mind the idea of *worshipping* implied here in עֲבַד. The correct vocalization might have been תִּנְשְׁנִי, or possibly, though less probably, as an intensive תִּנְשְׁנִי.

44.23a: רָנוּ שָׁמַיִם כִּי-עָשָׂה ה'.—Read קִי־עָשָׂה ה' from r. עוֹשֶׁה (with *šin*), cf. Arab. gāṭa “to rescue.” This is the actual parallel to ה' כִּי-נֹאֵל ה' in v. 23c. Cf. further below to 46.4 and 54.5.

44.28: הָאָמֵר לְכוּרֶשׁ.—This is parallel to וְלֹא אָמַר לִירוּשָׁלַם, cf. LXX and Syr. Thus אָמַר represents here the partic. אָמַר plus the *emph.* ל.

45.1: לֵרֵד לִפְנֵי נֹוִים.—Read לֵרֵד, and see above to 41.2.

45.8: וַיִּפְּרוּ יֵשַׁע.—For this verb perhaps cf. Egyptian, and see above to 11.1.

45.12: וְכָל-צִבְאָם צִוִּיתִי.—All the verbs mentioned in this verse convey primeval cosmic acts directly performed by the Creator—(נָטִיתִי (שָׁמַיִם), בְּרָאתִי (אָדָם), עָשִׂיתִי (אָרֶץ). The usual צוה “to command” is not appropriate here. For our צִוִּיתִי (= צִוֵּאתִי) cf. Arab. dawwa'a “to make a th. to shine brightly,” (light a lamp, light up a house, etc.). As it refers here to heavenly luminaries, sun, moon and stars, we should naturally translate, “And all their host *have I caused to shine brightly.*”

This root and meaning are further borne out very clearly by Job 36.32 where the correct reading would be *במרפנע* (ם) *יִצּוּ עֲלֵיהֶם* "And He *illuminates* them in *one stroke*"; thus offering good parallelism with *כסה אור* (sic) *עַל כְּפִים* "He covered the *rocks* with light(-ning)." Then *בסה אור* = *יִצּוּ*.

45.16: *בושו וגם נכלמו . . . יחדו הלכו . . .*—All these perfects are evidently in the *optative* mood,⁴¹ as suggested by the context. Cf. *א ב ד ו גוים מארצו* Ps. 10.16.

46.4: *אני עשיתי ואני אשא*.—Read *עֲשֵׂתִי*, with *šin*, and compare to 44.23a and 54.5. This is obviously parallel to *אמלט* as *אשא* is to *אסבל*. The reason for the inversion becomes self-evident from a translation: "I *have rescued* and I bear, Yea I will carry and *will deliver*."

46.11: *עֵט . . . איש עצתי*.—"A bird of prey" is out of place here. One might tentatively suspect a metathesis for *טִיעִי* "(my) servant" (resp. *טִיעו* "his servant," cf. *ketib* *עצתו*) from Arab. *ṭā'a* (r. *טיע*) "to obey a. o., respect").⁴² Compare *ṭayyi'* (or *ṭā'i*, or *ṭā'* or *ṭuw'*) "obedient, submissive." For the semantic development cf. Talm.-Aram. *שמע(א)* "servant"—from *שמע* "to hear" and *משמעת* "obedience." Render the whole clause, "Calling my *servant* from the east."

For *אף-דברתי* see the parallel *יצרתי*, and comp. above to 8.10.

47.12: *אולי תערוצי*.—This is surely a metathesis for *תעצורי* which is a good parallel to *תוכלי*. Indeed, in later style the verb *עצר*—originally in a phrase *עצריכה*—is frequently enough employed in the sense of "be able (to)" especially before an infinitive as complement. Comp. 1 Chr. 29.14, 2 Chr. 2.5, and esp. 2 Chr. 14.10, 20.37. Thus translate the whole line, "Perhaps thou canst profit, Perhaps thou wilt *be able to*." After *תעצורי* supply *הועיל* by parallelism.

⁴¹ See footn. 17.

⁴² Cf. also *al-muṭṭawwi'atu* (> *muṭatawwi'atu*) "the holy-war volunteer." See Ibn Qotayba, in Derenbourg & Spiro's *Chrestom. élém. de l' arabe littéral*, p. 62, l. 3 (2d ed., Paris 1892, Leroux).

49.15: מרחם בן-בטנה.—Undoubtedly מרחם stands here for אסרחם, this particle duly introducing the second member of a double interrogation (ה...אם). For רחם, as an archaic synonym of אשה, viz. "human female," compare Ju. 5.30 רחם רחמתי and the plural רחמת in the Moabite Stone, line 17.⁴³

From the ח in the dual רחמתי one might infer a reading *רחמת* or *רחמה* for the sing. with the present connotation. In view, however, of the Rās Shamra epic where, instead of the frequent בתלה ענת "the virgin Anath," also רחם ענת⁴⁴ is occasionally met with,—the above inference would seem premature.

49.16: על כפים חקתיך.—Vocalize כפים as in Job 36.32 (see above to 45.12). Compare Jer. 4.29, Job 30.6. The parallelism with חומתיך might thus be more natural.

50.7-9: יה' יעזרלי.—This verb has not the usual connotation "to help." The context of the whole passage as well as the parallelism in v. 7a and v. 9a clearly suggest that in both these instances יה' יעזרלי would best cover an expression synonymous with מצדיקי "he (that) justifies me." In fact, this verb is identical with Arab. 'aḍara "to excuse, to free a. o. from blame." Thus, e. g., render v. 9a "Behold, the Lord God frees me from blame; Who is he that shall condemn me?"

53.12: וּלְפָשְׁעִים יִפְּנֶה.—Read best יִפְּנֶה, passive *qal*, and translate the whole line: "Yet he bore the sin of many, And was struck for the transgressors." Compare this with v. 6b וְהָיָה בְּוָאֵת עוֹן כָּלנוּ.

54.3: וְזָרְעֵךְ גּוֹיִם יִירֶשׁ.—No "nations" can be meant here, since גּוֹיִם is parallel to עַרְסֵי נַשְׁמוֹת and the context speaks only of the return of the exiles to their own fatherland. On more than one occasion, however, I have pointed out⁴⁵ that ancient Hebrew had,

⁴³ G. E. Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 1, l. 3 bottom; Oxford 1903, the Clarendon Press.

⁴⁴ See Ginsberg in *Tarbiz*, vol. IV, no. 1, p. 109 (Heb. Univ. Press).

⁴⁵ See my *A Contrib. to Bib. Lex.*, pp. 32-33; and "Some Philol. Observ. in Daniel," in a forthcoming issue of the *REJ*.

besides גוי "nations," another vocable גוי—probably with a different vocalization (perhaps גוי*—pl. גוים, cf. גלי—כלים)—as a synonym of ארץ in all connotations fitting a large extent of land, viz. "land, region, country." Compare, e. g., LXX τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς and Targ. חיתו גוי בר א for Zeph. 2.14, or⁴³ Dan. 8.22 מני with its Aram. parallel 7.17 מן ארעא. Similarly render the above, "And thy seed shall take possession of *lands*" etc.

54.5: עשיך.—Probably, here too, read עשך (pl. *majestatis*) "thy Rescuer," from r. עוש. Compare here ונאלך (קדוש ישראל), and see above to 44.23 and 46.4.

54.12: ושעריך לא בני אקרח.—Here and in the subsequent דכר the ל merely represents the emphatic particle. Cf. *without* any particle.

57.6: בחלקי נחל חלקך.—No worshipping of "smooth stones of the valley" with offerings or sacrifices can be substantiated in the Bible by the least hint. Here there is obviously question of a popular cult of some importance. One would expect to find here mentioned that of *demons*; cf. שדים and שעירים to which—to the former surely—even human sacrifices would be offered, Deut. 32.17 and Ps. 106.37, Lev. 17.7 and 2 Chr. 11.15.

Indeed, חלקי נחל may simply mean "*people of the valley*," cf. Arab. ḥalq "creatures, people" and Mish. בריות. The whole phrase would refer to *valley-demons* just as Arab. āḥlu'l-arḍ lit. "people of the earth" or "earthfolk"⁴⁶ was the pre-Islamic designation for *earth-demons*. The reason for using here an expression that seems now rare was to improve the opportunity for a word-play with חלקך.

57.10: על-כן לא חלית.—This verb is related to Eth. ḥallaya "to think of, consider, care for, heed, be worried about." Cf. in v. 11, the paraphrase לא זכרת לא שמת על-לבך as well as the synonym דאנת. The same connotation is further

⁴⁶ See Canaan's "Haunted Springs and Water Demons in Palestine," *JPOS*, esp. p. 153; also M. Bittenwieser, *The Book of Job*, p. 170 (New York 1922, MacMillan Co.).

undoubtedly represented in the following biblical instances: (1) Jer. 5.3 as exhibited by parallelism—חלו אותם ולא חלו (read *mil'el*) כליהם מאנו קחת-מוסר; (2) 1 Sam. 22.8 ואין-חולה מכם עלי וגולה את אוני... הכוני כל חליתי; (3) Prov. 23.35 speaking of the *unconsciousness* characteristic of a state of inebriety.

Obviously here belongs also Am. 6.6 על שבר יוסף ולא נחלו על שבר יוסף. For the simple and reflexive stems with similar meaning, cf. שאר. For the simple and reflexive stems with similar meaning, cf. שאר. For the simple and reflexive stems with similar meaning, cf. שאר. For the simple and reflexive stems with similar meaning, cf. שאר.

For further proof of the existence in North-Semitic of a verb חלה "to think of, care for, mind, etc.," compare talmudic Aram. in the phrase ולא מרגיש חלי, since in Aramaic the typical Hebrew חלה "be sick" is unknown.

As to the probable semantic development of the same root in Arabic ("be alone"), on the one hand, and, on the other, in Hebrew ("be sick") and Ethiopic resp. in two different directions,—this point was hinted at somewhere else.⁴⁸

58.13: ודבר דבר—This evidently means "to manage, arrange, settle"=Arab. *dábbara*; see above to 8.10.

59.6: ולא יתכסו במעשיהם.—Again a pun. As made clear from the parallel קוריהם לא-יהיו לבגד, we have here in מעשיהם a concrete noun from עשה "to cover"=Arab. *ḡašiya*, see above to 32.6. Thus מעשיהם is quite synonymous with כסותם. The immediately following homonym, however, has the usual meaning of "acts, works," which has only lightly been intimated in the first metaphorically.

60.4: בנתיך על-צד תאמנה.—Unquestionably this verb is to be vocalized תַּאמִּינָה;⁴⁹ cf. Arab. 'amma (r. אמם) "to walk ahead, direct one's step towards," 'imām "leader," 'amām "before, in front of." For על-צד lit. "on the side" compare further Arab. ṣádad "neighborhood" and 'alā ṣádad "opposite"=in the neigh-

⁴⁷ Yōmā 22b and Bābā Ḳammā 20b: כמה לא חלי ולא מרגיש נברא דמריה סייעה.

⁴⁸ See במקרא in *Ševile Haḥinuk*, III, pp. 33–35 (March 1928, N. Y.).

⁴⁹ See "Heb. and Sem. Particles," *AJSL*, XLIV (1928), p. 259, footn. 5.

borhood of. Translate the whole, "And thy daughters *walk-ahead* towards the neighborhood." There need be no better parallel to the first hemistich than this with תִּאֲמָנָה as counterpart of יָבֹאוּ and על-צֶדֶק—of מִרְחוֹק. A curious hint at this original reading is actually preserved by the Massoretic omission of a dagesh forte in the *nūu*, which would necessarily have resulted from a clash of the here generally assumed r. אָמֵן with the fem. suffix נָה—.

It is further interesting to notice the presence of the same verb in Jer. 51.13 where אָמַת בָּצַעַךְ has in the parallel קֶצֶךָ. The common rendition as "The *measure* of thy *covetousness*" has first originated in the mistranslation of בָּצַעַךְ from בָּצַע "profit, unjust gain," then adjusting the preceding vocable (אָמַת) so as to obtain a possible sense. Now בָּצַעַךְ is here a synonym of קֶצֶךָ (Ehrlich), and to be connected with the verb "to complete, to finish" in יִבְצַע... מַעֲשָׁהוּ Isa. 10.12 and וִידִיו חִבְצַעְנָה Zach. 4.9, derived from the etymological meaning "to cut, cut off" (Isa. 38.12, Job 6.9) = Arab. *bāḏa'a* or *baḏḏa'a*. For the semantic evolution cf. קֶץ "end" < קָצַץ "to cut." The whole line might thus be rendered, "Thine end *is come*, Thy finish *has arrived*."

60.12: וְהַגּוֹיִם חָרְבוּ יַחְרָבוּ.—No need to emend וְהַגּוֹיִם on account of (וְהַמְּמַלְכָּה) הַגּוֹי "the nation" starting the verse. This גּוֹיִם (possibly voc. הַגּוֹיִם*) means "the countries." See above to 54.3 וּרְעַךְ גּוֹיִם יִרְשׁ.

60.13: מְקוֹם רַגְלִי.—This is a metaphorical phrase characterizing the Temple as the Lord's "*foot-stand*" (resp. foot-hold), cf. 66.1 הַדָּם רַגְלִי "My foot-stool." Grammatically מְקוֹם represents here Aramaizingly a *maṣḏar* (=standing) of קוּם "to stand," employed as an *abstractum pro concreto* (standing > "stand"). Thus the word מְקוֹם is similarly repeated in the same line, as found in the current translations. But render correctly: "(To beautify) the *place of My sanctuary*, And the *stand(ing) of My feet* I will make glorious."

Incidentally it may be remarked that, in keeping with parallelism, לְפָאֵר (ל+אִפְאֵר <) is very likely to represent here rather an imperfect plus the emphatic particle: "Verily, I will beautify."

60.14: **ציון קדוש ישראל**.—Again a pun. On the one hand, **ציון** is in the *construct* with **קדוש ישראל** as, in the parallel, **עיר** is with **ה'**, thus apparently representing a common noun—though so far unidentified and nowhere else met with in the Bible. On the other hand, it unmistakably alluded to the proper name Zion. This pun might prove all the more interesting because the identification of the common noun under discussion may eventually reveal the genuine derivation of the homonymous proper name itself.

Now, this appears to be the case, indeed. Considering that our *common noun*, as a counterpart to **עיר**, must be somehow synonymous with it, and that the *proper name* also is sometimes more fully described as “the *stronghold* of Zion” (**מְצֻדַת צִיּוֹן**),—it stands to reason that the common noun involved would be related to Eth. *ṣawan* “castle, fortification” and *taṣawwana* “munitus, munitionibus clausus est.” Compare further Arab. *ṣānā* (r. **צון**) “to keep, preserve,” particularly the Syro-Pal. intensive *ṣāwwana* “to surround with walls, to enclose” (= Eth.). Conclusion: The n. prop. loc. **ציון** *Zion* draws its origin from an archaic common noun **ציון** “stronghold, fortress” (<r. **צין*** “keep, preserve”),⁵⁰ as the *Stronghold* par excellence. Compare *Medina* = the City (of the Prophet).

Thus, while the proper and literal rendition of **ציון קדוש ישראל** is “The *Stronghold* of the Holy of Israel,” in accordance with the parallel “the city of the Lord,” it only playfully suggests “The Zion of the H. of I.”

For similar word-plays in Isaiah, see above to 13.12 **כתם ולא יתכסו במעשיהם** 59.6, and **על סוס ננוס** 30.16, **אופיר**.

61.3: **מַעֲטָה תְּהִלָּה**.—This is opposed to **רוח כְּהָה** “the spirit of heaviness” (lit. *dimness, dullness*); render then “a mantle (lit. *wrap*) of *brightness*” = bright colors. Indeed, **תְּהִלָּה** here <r. **הלל** “shine,” Isa. 13.10 and Job 29.3, 31.26, 41.10. For the whole

⁵⁰ Contrast Paul de Lagarde, *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 198; Göttingen 1889, Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung. The Syr. **צהיון**, although borrowed, might even substantiate our derivation from a root *ṣwn*, the **ה** frequently representing the Aramaic equivalent of the *second* radical in this group of verbs **ע״ו**; cf. e. g. Heb. **בוש**, **רוץ** and Aram. **רהט**, **בהה**, etc.

Gen. 47.11 מִיטב שָׂדֵהוּ etc., or מִיטב אֶקוּה etc., etc., or מִיטב שָׂדֵהוּ etc. Instead of this common term, however, מִשְׁנָה is here used in order to afford a pun with the homonym ("double") of the preceding line.

63.3: וּכְלִמְלוּשִׁי אֶגְלִילִי.—The verb cannot represent a *hif'il*. It may, however, eventually prove to be a *kal* with prosthetic א, a form occasionally met with in various Aramaic languages, esp. in Talmudic. Compare, e. g., [חֲמַרְא] Dan. 5.3, 4 and similarly in Targum and Syriac; or [בֵּית הַלֵּל] Naz. 32a (l. 8, bot.), [לֶר' יְהוּדָה] Hul. 93b, [לְמַתְנָא] Ned. 89b, etc. The *kal* of this verb should not appear very surprising in view of the *nif'al* נִפְּאֵלָה Zeph. 3.1 derived from it. After all, even יִגְאֻלוּ Job 3.5—despite the LXX and Sarūq—may belong here with Aquila, Pesh., Vulg., Targ. and outstanding medieval commentators (Rashi, Ibn-Ezra, Gersonides, etc.).

63.4: שְׁנַת נְאוּלִי.—This is parallel to יוֹם נֶקֶם, and LXX ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως "year of *redemption*" renders no possessive suffix. In fact נְאוּלִי represents here an archaic instance of⁵¹ abstract nouns with fem. ending -ay, like Ar. نحلى "gift," رجعى "answer," نعيمى "well-being" (cf. نعامى "south wind"), etc. See above to 34.17. In Hebrew, however, where that fem. suffix itself had soon become obsolete, these nouns have left only a number of sporadic remnants whenever they could be disguised under some other interpretation of the final yod, viz. as referring to 1st p. sing. or pl. (as here), or pl. construct. Compare, e. g., Gen. 30.13 בְּאִשְׁרִי = בְּנִדְרִי "with luck!" (Ehrlich) as parallel to verse 11 בְּנִדְרִי (LXX ἐν τυχῇ). In other cases the yod was dropped; cf. שְׁלוֹי = שְׁלוֹ in Samar., Syr. and Arab., and above to 34.17 (*בְּקוֹי < בְּקוֹ). The question of this feminine suffix in adjectives and abstract nouns in Hebrew is discussed with more details in my "Heb. and Sem. Particles."⁵²

66.14a: וְעֲצְמוֹתֵיכֶם כְּדָשָׁא תִפְרַחְנָה.—As a parallel to וְעֲצְמוֹתֵיכֶם לִבְכֶּם the meaning of וְעֲצְמוֹתֵיכֶם תִּפְרַחְנָה certainly is "And your bones shall *be cheerful*" = תִּגְלוֹנָה, cf. Arab. fáriḥa "to rejoice," be cheer-

⁵¹ Cf. Lagarde, *Op. cit.*, esp. p. 192.

⁵² *AJSL*, XLV, pp. 59-63.

ful." The word דשא may have appeared secondarily in the wake of misinterpreting here פרח as usually "to flourish" (cf. Arab. *fārḥa* "to sprout"), instead of the above archaic connotation that had become obsolete and forgotten. Otherwise the pun is not of the best kind. But comp. further the corresponding couplets of *two beats*—וּעַם אֶת אֵיבֵיוֹ (v. 14b), וְכִסּוּפָה מְרַכְבְּתִיו (v. 15a), וְנִעְרָתוֹ בְּלֶהֱבִי־אֵשׁ (v. 15b), etc.

Very probably the same archaic meaning of פרח, as a synonym of גִּיל וְשׂוֹשׁ, is also present in Isa. 35.1 where the second couplet would read וְתִגְלַל עֲרֵבָה וְתִפְרַח, the last word belonging to verse 2. The suggested emendation וְתִשְׂמַח (Ehrl.) is not necessary.

66.14b: וּעַם אֶת אֵיבֵיוֹ . . . יִדְּהָ אֶת עֲבָדָיו.—This is opposed to וּעַם (read וְעַמּוֹ). Conspicuously this יִדְּהָ points here—contrary to classic usage—to God's *favor*, which circumstance has induced some to emend יִדְּהָ וְנִוְרַעָה into וְנִוְרַעָה חֶסֶד ה'. This is superfluous. In fact, the essential connotation of יִדְּ = wadd is here "*favor*," "*fondness*," cf. יָדִיד "friend, beloved" and Arab. *wadda* "to love, be fond of" and wadd "love, attachment, wish" etc. It thus plays on the common homonym יִדְּהָ with a touch of irony in view of the parallel וּעַם אֶת אֵיבֵיוֹ. This is a better kind of pun.

The same derivation of יִדְּהָ, esp. in the sense of God's "will, wish," is transparent enough in Ezra-Nehemiah, *passim*, and 2 Chr. 30.12. Thus, e. g., כִּדְיָהּ = later (ה') כִּרְצוֹן. Comp. esp. in Syr.-Pal. dialect the current phrase, *biddi*, *biddak*, etc. (from *biwiddi*, etc.) "I wish, thou wishest" etc.*

* [Samuel I. Feigin of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago kindly consented to read the proofs of this article.—Ed.]

THE ETYMOLOGY OF HEBREW *MŪL* OR *MŌL* AND ITS BEARING ON *TMŌL* AND *'ETMŌL*

JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia

THE etymology of the Hebrew word מול or, as it is written in Deut. 1.1, מול, used in the Scriptures both as a substantive presumably meaning "front" and as a preposition meaning "in front of," has caused considerable difficulty to philologists and grammarians throughout the ages. Medieval Jewish lexicographers considered it a weak verb of the ע"ו type, and, for the lack of a better, generally coupled it together with מול "circumcise."¹ In later years an attempt was made to derive it from an ע"ע stem מלל, supposedly meaning "oppose" in Arabic.² Only in modern times did grammarians like Gesenius³ and Olshausen⁴ begin to realize that the מ of מול might be a preformative. They consequently threw out the suggestion that מול probably stands for קמול, derived from a stem אול which in Arabic means "to be first, in front."⁵ The weakness of this suggestion lies in the circumstance that only in one case out of many, and that a doubtful case, does the word occur in an

¹ Comp., e. g., Mehaḥem ben Sarūk, מחברת מנחם, ed. Filipowski, s. v. מל; Ibn Janah, *Kitāb al-Uṣūl*, ed. Neubauer, Ibn Parḥon, מחברת הערוך, ed. Stern, and David Ḳimḥi, ספר השרשים, ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht, s. v. מול.

² Comp., for instance, Joh. Simonis, *Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum*, Halae Magdeburgicae 1771, s. v. מול. According to Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, this derivation is based on Castell's *Lexicon Heptaglotton*, London 1669, col. 2061, where under the stem مَلَّ the expression مَلَّ إِلَى = *opposuit* is registered. But as a matter of fact, as proved by a reference to Arabic lexica, the stem مَلَّ, whether with or without a preposition, never has that connotation.

³ *Thesaurus*, s. v. מול.

⁴ *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, §223c.

⁵ Similarly Haupt in *AJSL.*, XXII, 250 and 253. But, as pointed out by Ehrlich in his comment on Ex. 18.19, a stem אול could yield in Hebrew only the form קמול or at the utmost קאל (comp. קצד), but not קמול.

enlarged form with א, מואל supposedly instead of מול.⁶ Ewald, in addition to אול, thought also of a stem יאל, from which מואל might have been derived.⁷ Lagarde considered מול = מאל = מאלה signifying "phallus" in Egyptian and Coptic (derived from a stem אלי).⁸ Some even endeavored to explain מול as a contraction from מהל = مهل "to be foremost."⁹ In recent years König reverted to the old view that מול might be derived from מול "cut off" (comp. ימולל in Ps. 90.6) and construed in the sense of "front section."¹⁰

After a fresh study of the problem I have reached the conclusion that מול should properly be derived from a doubly weak stem ולי, Arabic ولي, meaning "be near, adjacent,"¹¹ and be construed as a concrete personal noun of the type *miktal*,¹² equivalent to the Arabic مولى meaning "friend, companion, follower," which in neo-Arabic likewise appears in an apocopated form مول.¹³ Phonetically this is not impossible: the first radical

⁶ Neh. 12.38 *ketib* למואל, *kre* למול, which some modern commentators emend to לשמאל.

⁷ *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*,⁸ §217, 1. He does not designate the exact meaning of such a supposed stem; both the Hebrew יאל "show willingness" and Arabic وأل "seek shelter" fail to satisfy the required meaning of מול.

⁸ *Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lateinischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments*, p. 48; also *Mitteilungen*, II, 254.

⁹ Meier, *Wörterbuch*, p. 490.

¹⁰ *Lehrgebäude*, II, 300. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* to Ex. 18.19, suggests the possibility of deriving it from the Arabic stem مال "lean, incline," but refrains from pressing it. Other solutions, such as Fürst's claim that מול is composed of מל א, hardly deserve any consideration.

¹¹ Comp. Dozy, *Supplément*, II, 842 f.; Biberstein-Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire*, II, 1606 f.

¹² See Barth, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 240 ff., and comp. the common nouns מודע and מרע, both meaning "friend."

¹³ Comp. Dozy, *Supplément*, II, 844, col. 1. In modern Arabic there is a tendency to drop the final *ia*: thus, for instance, مولى in the construct state loses the final vowel in Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli and Sénégal, sounding *mül*; in some places here the word sounds *mül* even in the absolute (W. Marçais, *Le Dialecte Arabe parlé a Tlemcen*, Paris 1902, p. 43 f., also *Textes Arabes de Tanger*, Paris 1911, p. 500; comp. also H. Stumme, *Grammatik*

war having become a long vowel and accented the tendency was to drop the final *ia*.¹⁴ However, semasiologically this solution appears to be very plausible, as a reference to the biblical passages in which the word מול occurs as a substantive will easily prove.

Let me state outright that I first arrived at this derivation through a study of the ever difficult and baffling passage in Mic. 2.8: וְאַתְּמוּל עָמִי לְאֹיֵב יְקוֹמָם מִמּוֹל שְׁלֵמָה אֲדָר תִּפְשְׁטוּן מַעֲבְרִים וְאַתְּמוּל עָמִי לְאֹיֵב יְקוֹמָם מִמּוֹל שְׁלֵמָה בְּטָח שׁוֹבֵי מִלְחָמָה, which is rendered quite awkwardly in ancient and modern versions, somewhat as follows: "But of late (literally "yesterday") My people is risen up as an enemy; with the garment ye strip also the mantle from them that pass by securely, so that they are as men returning from war."¹⁵ Not only does this rendering fail to do justice to the Hebrew text semanti-

des tunisischen Arabisch, Leipzig 1896, p. 92, and *Märchen und Gedichte aus der Stadt Tripolis in Nordafrika*, Leipzig 1898, §151d, p. 52, line 21). The same holds true of the Arabic dialect in Syria and Palestine (comp., e. g., G. R. Driver, *A Grammar of the Colloquial Arabic of Syria and Palestine*, London 1925, p. 13) and also elsewhere.

¹⁴ One is naturally reminded of the apocopated forms of the verbs *tertiaie ia* in Arabic and ל"ה in Hebrew, and particularly of some nouns *tertiaie ia* which drop the *ia* after *kesra*, as عم "blind" for عَمِي, شِيع "sorrowful" for شِيعِي, قَاضٍ "a judge" for قَاضِي, and so on, comp. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*,³ I, 156; Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, pp. 1 ff; Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, pp. 109 ff. Some such change or modification might be expected in doubly weak verbs, i. e. verbs *primae war* and *tertiaie ia*. Thus we find that in some cases the apocopated form maintained itself on the side of the longer form, as موسى "razor" on the side of موسى, both derived from a stem وصى "shave" (comp. on this formation Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, I, 262 f.) or موسى "testator" on the side of موسى, both derived from a stem وصى "bequeath."

¹⁵ Septuagint: καὶ ἐμπροσθεν ὁ λαὸς μου εἰς ἐχθραν ἀντέστη, κατέναντι τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ ἐξέδειραν τοῦ ἀφελῆσαι ἐλπίδας συντριμμὸν πολέμου (implying שְׁלֵמָה for שְׁלֵמָה and שָׁבֵר for שׁוֹבֵי). The Targum is free and paraphrastic. Vulgate: *Et e contrario populus meus in adversarium consurrexit, desuper tunica pallium sustulit, et eos qui transibant simpliciter convertit in bellum*. Peshitta: וְאַתְּמוּל עָמִי לְאֹיֵב יְקוֹמָם מִמּוֹל שְׁלֵמָה בְּטָח שׁוֹבֵי מִלְחָמָה (following probably the Septuagint in reading שְׁלֵמָה). Similarly the other versions, which only differ in minor points.

cally and syntactically,¹⁶ but it also fails to square with the general sense of the passage, which turns about the oppression and exploitation of the poor by the rich. What place has here a phrase like "My people is risen up as an enemy"? An enemy of what or of whom, one might ask. Certainly not an enemy of Yahweh, as maintained by some, since the passage deals only with the clash of classes among themselves; nor an enemy of themselves, which has no sense. As to the possible enmity of one class towards another, as the rich to the poor, the general term *מִי* militates against it. Medieval commentators and lexicographers offer no help in elucidating this passage,¹⁷ nor can any tangible aid be gotten from modern exegetes who generally operate with emendations, some awkward and some ingenious, but none superior to the masoretic text.¹⁸ Since the chief difficulty lies in *ואחמול* and *אויב* appears to be its opposite, it occurred to me that the construction of *מול* as "friend" or "ally" is very relevant and apposite here and may have very early antecedents, though no trace of it had been left in the versions. Accordingly I render the verse as follows: "And the friend of my people¹⁹ it (namely my people)²⁰ raiseth up into an enemy, off a friend ye strip garment and mantle,²¹ off those who pass by securely as if

¹⁶ Apart from the semantic difficulty of *ואחמול* it is evident that *יקום* as a *Pō'lel* must be transitive, not intransitive; nor is the construction of the following clauses at all invulnerable: *ממול שלמה* can never mean "with the garment" and *שובי* cannot signify "returning."

¹⁷ Rashi's comment *ad loc.* deserves to be quoted: *ואח הדבר אשר למולו* and *ואחמול* as composed of *אח* meaning "from" and *מול* meaning "opposite," rendering the phrase as follows: *وبازاء شعبي تقيمون عدواً اي تسلطون عليهم* (*Kitāb al-Uṣūl*, ed. Neubauer, s. v. *تمل*).

¹⁸ As, for instance, Wellhausen who reads *על* *ואחמול* for *ואחמול* and *ממול שלמה* for *שובי*. Other emendations hardly deserve mention.

¹⁹ Reading *ואחמול* as two words: *ואח מול*, like Ibn Janah, comp. above note 17.

²⁰ Or taking *יקום* as an impersonal construction, rendered by "one raiseth up."

²¹ *אדר* may easily have been miswritten from *אדרת* through haplography.

they were captives of war.”²² This rendering not only restores the required force to each of the three clauses of the sentence, but also makes them articulate with each other through a common link, namely the idea “ye turn a friend into an enemy,” which in my rendering appears in each one of the three clauses.

However, even apart from this passage in Micah, there are several places in the Bible where this connotation of מול is clearly substantiated. Ex. 18.19 הִנֵּה אָתָּה לְעַם מֹל הָאֱלֹהִים is almost inevitably rendered “be thou to the people a representative of God,”²³ that is one who is nearer to God than the people, a connotation necessarily leading to the stem ולי=ולה “be near, contiguous.” Again 1 Sam. 17.30 וַיִּסָּב מֵאַחַד מֹל אֶחָד, generally translated “and he turned away from him toward another,” as if מול were another preposition besides אַל, should properly be rendered “and he (namely David) turned away from him (namely his eldest brother Eliab) toward another kinsman or friend or companion” (literally “one near to him”), construing מול as a substantive and אַחַר as an adjective modifying it.²⁴ Lev. 5.8 וְקָלַךְ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ מִמּוֹל עֶרְפוֹ apparently means “and he shall

²² I construe שׁוּבִי as a pl. constr. participle of the passive *kal* of שָׁבָה “take captive.” This passive *kal* or *kufila* form, misunderstood until recent years when Böttcher first called attention to it in his *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, §905 f., must have sounded originally *kufal*; but according to the rules of Hebrew phonetics the short *u* in the first open syllable, which is essential here as the characteristic vowel of the passive, could not maintain itself except through artificial sharpening of the following consonant, the second radical, or through artificial lengthening of this *u* vowel itself, comp. Barth’s illuminating discussion in *Jubelschrift zum 70. Geburtstag des Dr. Israel Hildesheimer*, Berlin 1890, pp. 145 ff. As a matter of fact, both these expedients were used, though the former is by far the more frequent. Hence the participle of the passive *kal*, modelled after the perfect, generally takes the form קָשַׁל, more rarely קִמּוֹל, see Gesenius-Bergsträsser, II, 87. With regard to שׁוּבִי in the passage under discussion, the long *u* might be explained as an artificial lengthening of the original short *u* in an open syllable.

²³ So Dillmann, Baentsch, Driver, and others, all going back to Rashi’s interpretation *ad loc.*: מִלְּמֹךְ בִּינֹהֶם לְמֹךְ.

²⁴ It is interesting to note that Kimḥi *ad loc.* corroborates this interpretation: אֶל מֹל אֶדָּם אַחֵר שֶׁהָיָה מֹל זֶה הַמָּקוֹם. Attention should also be called to the fact that a variant reading of the Septuagint εἰς μέρος ἕτερον apparently construes מול as a substantive.

pinch off its (the pigeon's) head in the proximity of its neck," in which sense it is rendered by some versions and commentaries.²⁵ Finally, Num. 8.2 **אֶל-מֹל פְּנֵי הַמְנוּכָה יֵאִירוּ שִׁבְעַת הַנְּרוֹת** should probably be rendered "in the proximity of the front of the candlestick shall the seven lamps give light."²⁶ Naturally, anything that is near and contiguous to something may also be said to be facing or fronting it. Hence the development of this noun into a preposition meaning "in front of," in which sense it largely occurs in the Bible.

Any discussion of the origin of the word **מֹל** necessarily leads to the consideration of the closely related and ever debated word **מָמֹל** or **מָמֹל** meaning "yesterday." The word occurs twenty-three times in the briefer form **מָמֹל** and only eight times in the fuller form **מָמֹל מָמֹל**.²⁷ It has its counterpart in Aramaic **מָמֹל** and **מָמֹל**, Syriac **ܡܡܠܐ**, more frequently **ܡܡܠܐ**, Assyrian *itimāli* or *timāli*, and Ethiopic *temālem*.²⁸ Now what is really the nature of this word and how did it come to designate the day before this day? Ibn Janah²⁹ explains **מָמֹל** as composed of two words, **מִן** meaning "from" and **מֹל** meaning "front."³⁰ Kimḥi³¹ derives it from an imaginary stem **מָמֹל**, construing the

²⁵ Comp., for instance, the American Jewish version "close by its neck," which is based on medieval Jewish commentaries. Interesting is the interpretation of this phrase in the Talmud Hul. 19b: **מֹל הַרְוָהּ אֵת הָעוֹרֵף** "the near or front side which sees the neck."

²⁶ In translating "in front of the candlestick," as most versions do, the value of **מֹל** is lost entirely. Hence Sifra *ad loc.* remarks **עָשָׂה לָהּ מֹל פְּנִים** "make to it (to the candlestick) something opposite facing the face."

²⁷ Once, in 1 Sam. 10.11, vocalized **מָמֹל**, perhaps due to analogy with the following **שָׁלֵשׁ**, and another time, in Isa. 30.33, if we disregard the passage in Micah discussed above, written **מָמֹל**, perhaps likewise due to analogy with the preceding **צִוִּיךָ**.

²⁸ Comp. Gesenius-Buhl and Brown-Driver-Briggs, s. v. **מָמֹל**. According to Friedrich Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, p. 132 note, Assyr. *itimāli* is composed of *itū* "side" and *māla* "front": "yesterday" was originally "of front side."

²⁹ See above, note 17.

³⁰ This view is endorsed by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 777) who explains **מָמֹל** as *conflatum ex* **מִן** (**מִן**), *apud, ad, et* **מֹל**, **מֹל**, hence the same as **מִן-פְּנִים**.

³¹ **מָמֹל**, ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht, s. v. **מָמֹל**.

initial *ʾ* as a prosthetic *aleph*.³² Merx³³ derives it from the Arabic stem *ملى* which in the second conjugation means "to prolong," and he equates its form with the infinitive of the sixth conjugation: *تمال*. The initial *ʾ* he explains, of course, as prosthetic. This view is favored also by König.³⁴ But while morphologically there can be no objection to this derivation (the final *ia* could have undergone apocope), semantically one may ask how "prolongation" came to mean "yesterday." Ewald³⁵ assumes that the Ethiopic form *temālem*, being the longer, is the original form, hence he is of the singular opinion that *תמול* is a contraction of the words *הם עולם* "past is time," or "gone is the day." Finally Haupt,³⁶ comparing Assy. *itimāli* = *ittimāli* = *intimāli* = *ina timāli*, explains *תמול* as composed of *ת* and *מול*, *ת* corresponding to *ina* and *מול* to *māl* = *mā'al* "front," derived from a stem *אול*, Arab. *اول*, "be in front."

I venture the opinion that *תמול* or *תמול* consists of the word *מול* signifying, as pointed out above, "one that is near," and the apodictic, demonstrative particle *ה* meaning "this" or "that."³⁷ The initial *ʾ* is, of course, a prosthetic *aleph*.³⁸ Accordingly, the original connotation of *תמול* and *תמול* must have been "that day which is contiguous to this day," hence "yesterday."³⁹ This seems to be a plausible explanation of the word, whose semantic

³² This derivation from a supposed stem *תמל* has been perpetuated in practically all our dictionaries and lexica.

³³ *Grammatica Syriaca*, p. 118.

³⁴ *Lehrgebäude*, II, 264 f.

³⁵ *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, §77a.

³⁶ *AJSL*, XXII (1905-1906), 250 f.

³⁷ Concerning the *ה* demonstrative comp. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, p. 83, where the phrase *הי נפש מראל קיש* "this is the monument of M." is quoted from the old Arabian inscription of Namāra, line 1 (comp. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, II, 34). This demonstrative is also current in neo-Arabic dialects, comp., for instance, Rhodokanakis, *Der vulgärarabische Dialekt im Ḍoḡār*, I, 32, where the following phrase occurs: *ta fil-leyl* "there in the night."

³⁸ Exactly as in *אורוע*, *אצודה* etc.

³⁹ This is especially evident from a passage like Job 8.9 *כי חמול אנתנו ולא* נדע, which apparently means "for we are near (namely recent or young) and do not know," comp. Rabbi Zerahya ben Isaac ben Shealtiel of Barcelona *ad loc.* (in *תקות אנוש*, ed. Schwarz): *כי נערים אנתנו*.

development as outlined above could probably be corroborated also from other languages, not necessarily Semitic. As to the demonstrative particle, it appears that it was attached to all temporal nouns of this type, either at the beginning or at the end of the word, as ה in היום "to-day,"⁴⁰ ת in תהרה "to-morrow" on the side of תהרה,⁴¹ and ם in םשלשם "day before yesterday."⁴²

⁴⁰ Comp. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, pp. 72 ff.

⁴¹ The origin of מחר is still very obscure, though in most cases it is either associated with Assyrian *māḫru* "front," often used of time, or else equated with מאחר and derived from the stem אחר. For a recent discussion of this problem and a proposed solution comp. Israel Eitan in *AJSL*, XLVI (1929), 45 f.

⁴² Comp. Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES

JULIUS LEWY, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

I

גנח "TO GROAN"

THE correctness of the ἄπαξ λεγόμενον גָּחַי in Micah 4.10a (חֹלִי גָּחַי בַּת צִיּוֹן כִּי יוֹלְדָהּ כִּי עָתָה תִּצְאֵי מִקְרִיָּה) has been questioned by various scholars. Elshorst and Cheyne proposed, on the basis of Jer. 48.31, its emendation into חָגִי. Buhl, more radically, replaced it, in view of Isa. 42.14, by פָּעִי. Graetz, finally, changed it into הִאָּנַחִי, a proposal which has been accepted by Marti on the farfetched supposition that some signs of the text had been effaced.¹ As long as it is maintained that גָּחַי is the imperative *kal* of גִּיחַ "to spring forth," an emendation of the traditional text is indeed inevitable, because the then resulting translation of גָּחַי is incompatible with the preceding imperative חֹלִי "tremble".² It must, however, be doubted whether the current presupposition that גָּחַי is an imperative of גִּיחַ, due to an assimilation of גִּיחַ to the imperatives of the verba mediae geminatae,³ is correct. For it is also possible that גָּחַי is the imperative of a root גנח. Imperatives of the *kal* with an *o*-vowel in the first syllable appear elsewhere in Hebrew and are to be considered as regular.⁴ The assimilation of נ to a following consonant is almost as widespread in Hebrew as in other Semitic languages and occurs also before ח.⁵

¹ See Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton* (1904), p. 285. Cf. Gesenius-Buhl s. v. חָגִי.

² The correctness of חֹלִי is assured by the LXX.

³ Cf. Bauer-Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (1922), p. 398.

⁴ Cf., e. g., קָלְכִי Jud. 9.10 (Bauer-Leander, *loc. cit.*, p. 306; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*²⁸, p. 131.)

⁵ Cf. Bauer-Leander, *loc. cit.*, p. 198; Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I, p. 174.

In Syriac (where *gunḥa* "concussion," "earthquake," "amazement" appears, dialectically, also as *guḥa*, i. e., *guhḥa*)⁶ the root גנח means "to become consternated," "to be dismayed."⁷ This meaning fits rather well into the context of Micah 4.10a. But it is not even necessary to go to the Aramaic dialects, since the postbiblical Hebrew dictionary offers in גנח "to groan," "to moan"⁸ a synonym of פעה and נאנח. On the simple supposition that this root belonged also to the biblical vocabulary, we obtain thus the same satisfactory translation of Micah 4.10a as the above-quoted scholars, but without any, more or less forced, emendation of the traditional text.

II

אָחַי "LEARNED"

There figures in the current Hebrew dictionaries and comparative Semitic grammars an adjective אָחַי to which, with reference to Cant. 3.8a, the meaning "holding," "carrying" is usually assigned,⁹ evidently on the supposition that כלם אחי חרב מלמדי makes no sense if אָחַי is taken for the passive participle of אחו. In attributing to אָחַי an active sense, one pays, however, no attention to the parallelism of אָחַי חרב and קלמדי מלחמה which, while pointing to a passive participle rather than to an active adjective, implies that אָחַי stands here in a sense similar to קלמדי. This parallelism is not accidental. For the corresponding Akkadian verb *aḥāzu* "to take," "to grasp" is used in the sense of *prehendere* as well as *comprehendere* and appears occasionally also in parallelism with *lamādu* "to learn."¹⁰

⁶ See Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 52; Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*², p. 125.

⁷ See Brockelmann, *ibid.*, p. 125.

⁸ See Levy, *Neuhebr. and Chald. Wörterbuch* I, p. 347; Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim* I, p. 259, where the identity of the Syriac root *genah* with Hebrew גנח is considered possible.

⁹ Cf. Gesenius-Buhl s. v. אָחַי; Brockelmann, *Grundriss* I, p. 358; Barth, *Nominalbildung*², p. 175; Bauer-Leander, *loc. cit.*, p. 472.

¹⁰ For references see Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* s. v.

If, in consequence, we eliminate the active adjective אָחִי "holding," "carrying" from the Hebrew dictionary, the question arises as to whether the translation of אָחִי חָרַב by "instructed" or "learned (with regard to the) sword" is compatible with the traditional text. Were it perhaps not better to read כָּלֵם מֵאָחִי חָרַב instead of כָּלֵם אָחִי חָרַב? Certainly, this emendation would be easy in view of the comparatively numerous cases in which a grammatically satisfactory text can be obtained only by repeating the last consonant of one word at the beginning of the next word.¹¹ In our case, however, this seems superfluous, because it is not necessary to infer that only a participle *pu'al* of אָחִי should have the same meaning as מְלַמֵּד. For the well-known replacing of מְכַרֵּךְ and מְדַבֵּר by בְּרוּךְ and יְדֻבֹּר¹² proves that the passive participle *kal* may well have been used instead of a passive participle of the *pi'el*.

III

עֲצוּר וְעוּב "(THE) YET UNBORN AND (THE) BORN"

The expression עֲצוּר וְעוּב, literally "he who is shut up and he who is left," is admittedly one of the most obscure terms in the Old Testament. Many translators render it by "under age and of age,"¹³ but there are also commentators who propose one of the following translations: "unclean and clean,"¹⁴ "entitled to protection and unprotected,"¹⁵ "bound and free," "imprisoned or released," "married and unmarried," "kept in by legal im-

¹¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (1920), p. 5 ff.

¹² Cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*², p. 178.

¹³ For this translation cf., e. g., R. Kittel, *Die Bücher der Könige* (1900), p. 118; I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige* (1899), p. 95. The same translation ("Unmündige und Mündige") was accepted by the translators of Deuteronomy (32.36) and Kings (1 Ki. 14.10; 21.21; 2 Ki. 9.8; 14.26) in Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*² (1896).

¹⁴ For this translation ("Unreiner und Reiner") see particularly Schwally, *Semitische Kriegeraltertümer* I, p. 59.

¹⁵ This is the translation proposed by Yahuda in his interesting study "Über עֲצוּר וְעוּב und עֵר וְעֵזָה im Alten Testament" in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* XVI (1902), p. 240 ff.

purity or at large.”¹⁶ It is easy to see that, with the exception of “under age and of age,” all these translations are objectionable in view of the context of 1 Ki. 14.10; 21.21 and 2 Ki. 9.8 where עֶצֶר וְעוּב is added to מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר, evidently as an expression *per merismum* denoting the totality of those who are מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר, i. e., “(small) children.”¹⁷ But also the translation “under age and of age” or, as older commentators expressed it, *puer qui domi detinetur et qui emancipatus est*, is very questionable, because it is impossible to include in the term מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר children who are of full age. Moreover, there was, in the ancient Near East, no emancipation from the *patria potestas* which automatically took place at a certain age and which, therefore, would justify the division of a king’s descendants into children of age and children under age.¹⁸

From the lexicographical point of view, too, it must be doubted that עוּב means “emancipated” or “of age.” For there is no Semitic dialect in which the root עוּב has such a meaning. On the contrary, Akkadian *izbu* means “the new-born child.”¹⁹

Since it is a rule, on the other hand, that such Akkadian *killu* forms as *izbu* frequently have almost the same function as Hebrew *kaṭūl*,²⁰ it is, of course, not too daring to infer that

¹⁶ Cf. the (incomplete) list of the various translations of עֶצֶר וְעוּב given by Farrar, *The First Book of Kings*, p. 303.

¹⁷ That מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר cannot mean “(every) male”, has been substantiated by Yahuda, *loc. cit.*, p. 241 note 1, and by Haupt, *American Journal of Semitic Languages* XXII (1905/6), p. 254. Haupt should, however, not have quoted, for the purpose of comparison with מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר, the indecent German equivalent of *cacans in braccas* which mostly refers to timid soldiers but the less shocking German equivalent of *mingere in braccas*, a turn which refers, without any contemptuous bysense, to children of both sexes. Whoever has lived in Arabic villages knows that in Oriental countries small children of both sexes go to the nearest wall to relieve themselves.

¹⁸ The fact that מִשְׁחֵי בָקִיר עֶצֶר וְעוּב always refers to the descendants of a king disproves, of course, also the above-quoted translation of עֶצֶר וְעוּב by “bond-servants and free people.”

¹⁹ See particularly the “omens from births” published in Vols. XXVII and XXVIII of the *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*.

²⁰ Cf., e. g., *šipru* “he who was sent” = “messenger”; *širku* “that which has been given” = “gift,” “present.”

עֶזוּב has the same meaning as Akkadian *izbu*. It is further obvious that a word denoting the new-born child—literally “him who has been brought forth”—makes excellent sense in an expression in which we expect to find, in analogy to such other expressions *per merismum* as “young and old,” “male and female,”²¹ two contrasting adjectives applicable to small children. If, then, the second of these adjectives denotes the small child, it can hardly be doubted that the first of them refers to the unborn child, all the more since עֶצוּר “shut (in the womb)” is an adequate designation of a child which is still to be born.

The passage Deut. 32.36, in which עֶצוּר וְעֶזוּב is not in apposition to מִשְׁחֵן בְּקִיר, offers no further difficulties. The context deals with the anger of Jahweh and its effects on the life of Israel. It is quite natural that in this connection conception and birth are remembered and that the vivid description of the calamities overtaking the whole nation reaches a climax in the words אִזְלַת יָד וְאִפְסָ עֶצוּר וְעֶזוּב “Strength is gone, and unborn and born are no longer.”

Also in the passage 2 Ki. 14.26 f. where אִפְסָ עֶצוּר וְעֶזוּב is replaced by the fuller אִפְסָ עֶצוּר וְאִפְסָ עֶזוּב, the translation of עֶצוּר by “unborn” and of עֶזוּב by “born” complies with the context. The author of this insertion into the paragraph devoted to Jeroboam II wished to depict, in a few words but emphatically, Jeroboam’s successes which were won after it had seemed that Jahweh wanted to “exterminate the name of Israel from beneath the heaven.” So he describes the agony of the nation which preceded Jeroboam’s rule in the telling words “There was neither unborn nor born and there was no helper for Israel.”

²¹ It may be recalled that expressions denoting a totality by contrasting correlative adjectives occur in all Semitic languages; cf. particularly the large list of such phrases collected by Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax*, pp. 328 f. As for עֶצוּר וְעֶזוּב, it is worth noting that in 1 Ki. 21.21 and 2 Ki. 9.8 מִשְׁחֵן בְּקִיר have been separated by an erroneous ו, while in 1 Ki. 14.10 עֶצוּר וְעֶזוּב correctly stands in apposition to מִשְׁחֵן בְּקִיר. The Greek version proves that the mistake is comparatively old.

HEBREW BASED UPON GREEK AND LATIN TRANSLITERATIONS

ALEXANDER SPERBER

Jewish Theological Seminary, New York and Dropsie College, Philadelphia

INTRODUCTION

I. THE METHODICAL APPROACH

THE present study is an endeavor to give, as fully as the sources permit, an outline of a Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary based upon the Greek and Latin transliterations of Hebrew words and their respective derivatives. The sources of these transliterations date from the third century B.C.E. to the beginning of the fifth century C.E. Thus the end of this period antedates by several centuries the beginnings of the activities of the Masoretic school of Tiberias. Because of this, while arranging the transliterations, I did not consider the vocalization which the Masorites of Tiberias gave to the Hebrew words in question. For the better understanding of the transliteration I had put in juxtaposition merely the Hebrew consonants of the word to which the transliteration referred, without originally vocalizing these consonants, since the transliteration was meant to indicate how these consonants should be vocalized and read; for instance: מבלעדי *μεββελαδη* would mean that the word has to be read as מבלעדי, and not מבלעדי as the Masorites vocalized it; יחבל *ιβαλ* would be = יחבל, as against יחבל of the Masorites. But for reasons of practical utility, in the course of my work, I abandoned this method of leaving the Hebrew equivalents of the transliterations unvocalized, and I vocalized them with the Tiberian vowel signs. Although these vowel signs, which I added to the Hebrew consonants, are Tiberian, I did not always follow the Tiberian rules in applying them. Sometimes I used the Tiberian system to indicate the vowels which are presupposed by the transliterated text; for instance: חקצי, חקצי instead of the Tiberian

way of vocalizing these forms as *חֶלֶף, חֶפֶץ*. This method I followed in the relatively numerous cases, where the transliteration presupposes a word, different from that found in the Masoretic text; for instance: *חֶפֶץ, חֶפֶץ* as compared with their corresponding Masoretic forms *חֶפֶץ, חֶפֶץ*. Of course this method could not be followed throughout, since I could not vocalize a word like *חֶלֶם* to read *חֶלֶם*, thus following the transliteration *helem*, although this form has its parallel in the Aramaic *חֶלֶם*, since such a procedure would definitely diminish the intelligibility and practical utility of this study.

The necessity for vocalizing the Hebrew consonants first arose while dealing with those words, in which the transliteration yielded forms differing not only in pronunciation from the Masoretic reading, but actually changing the meaning of the Hebrew word as intended by the Masorites; for instance: *חֶפֶץ* instead of *חֶפֶץ*, or *חֶפֶץ* instead of *חֶפֶץ*. In order to bring into sharp relief the distinction between the Masoretic and the transliterated word, it was necessary to vocalize the Masoretic word too. The Tiberian system was used for this purpose, since this system covers—unlike the Babylonian or Palestinian system—the entire biblical Hebrew vocabulary. The Tiberian vocalization, therefore, serves only a practical end and is irrelevant for an appreciation of the problems dealt with in this study. Cf. also paragraphs XXV and XXVIII.

II. THE SOURCES

The material upon which this investigation is based, is to be found in three sources: 1) the transliterations of proper names in the *Septuagint*; 2) the material preserved from the *Second Column of Origen's Hexapla*; and 3) the transliterations of *St. Jerome*.

III. PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS

Each of these sources has already been dealt with in special monographs; so for instance the *Septuagint* by Cl. Könnecke in his paper *Die Behandlung der hebräischen Namen in der Septua-*

ginta, Stargard 1885; the Hexaplaric material most recently by O. Pretzl in *Biblische Zeitschrift* 1932, pp. 4–32; and Jerome by C. Siegfried in *ZA W*, IV, 1884, pp. 34–83. But all of them missed the point; for they considered the Masoretic textus receptus with its Tiberian vocalization as the Hebrew text which served as the basis for the Septuagint, St. Origen and St. Jerome respectively for their transliterations. In the early days of Könnecke and Siegfried one could hardly expect a more critical standpoint as regards the Masoretic text; and when we find that for instance Siegfried went sometimes even so far as to “correct”, according to the Masoretic text, Jerome’s spelling of a Hebrew word in his transliteration without noting down, that his citation is based upon such a “correction”—e. g. דֵּעָה deah instead of dea; רוּחַ ruah instead of rua; מַלְכֵּחֶם malchechem instead of melchechem—we may excuse it out of this consideration. But even Pretzl, who criticizes Max L. Margolis’ approach to the problem (in the latter’s paper “The pronunciation of שׁוֹא according to new Hexaplaric material,” *AJSL*, XXVI, p. 62 sq.), shows just the same misconception; cf. f. i. p. 8 in his paper, §I 3β where he advances a theory that the Greek ε was pronounced like “a” since it is used to indicate a pataḥ, as f. i. in δερχω for דֵּרְכוּ, δερχι for דֵּרְכִי, ρεγλαι for רִגְלִי. I am rather doubtful as to whether such a procedure is methodically justifiable. For I think that Pretzl would first have to prove from purely Greek sources that ε could have had the phonetic value of an α. But even then, a mere comparison of the words in question with their equivalent forms in the Babylonian vocalization would have taught him that according to this system דֵּרְךְ and רִגְלִי belong to the qitl-class, cf. דֵּרְכֵם. Prov. 1.31; דֵּרְכִי ib. 3.17; דֵּרְכִי ib. 11.5 (in Ms. Ec 1); further רִגְלִי Ps. 40.3 (in Ms. Ec 1) and רִגְלִי Ex. 25.26 (in Ms. Ea 5). In these cases the Greek transliteration and the Babylonian vocalization of Hebrew are in full agreement between themselves and both presuppose a pronunciation of Hebrew, different from what the Tiberian Masorites offer us. This most essential point Pretzl failed to see. I deal with these details at length so as to show that all the research that has been done in this field until now could not spare me the trouble of starting my own investigation from the very beginning, i. e. to go through the sources indicated above

for collecting my material. And may I be permitted here to say that it was not an easy task at all to find the proper method for arranging and classifying the large amount of material, which first seemed to contradict itself in nearly every detail. I did my best to present the results of long years of continuous study in such a form, as may interest the serious minded student of Hebrew Grammar, without making him aware of the uncountable difficulties which I had to overcome before I found my way out of this labyrinth.

IV. HEBREW PROPER NAMES IN THE SEPTUAGINT

In the first chapter of my *Septuagintaprobleme* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1929) I dealt only with such forms of transliterated proper names as indicated an accumulating corruption in the Greek spelling in the various Mss. The thesis was there advanced that the growing inaccuracies in such spellings were proofs of the later date of the more corrupt Ms. At the present time however we are concerned only with those transliterations which accurately reproduce the Hebrew consonants. This consideration applies only to the consonants, since the vocalization of the Tiberian Grammarians is irrelevant to a study of the systems of vocalization used by the transliterators. Thus, to give an instance, if the Masoretic text reads צִלְפָּחָד and the Septuagint renders it Σαλπααδ, then the only possible conclusion is that in the time of the Septuagint the name was still pronounced צִלְפָּחָד, which corresponds to צִלְפָּחַד in the Tiberian system (cf. *B.-L.* §14z and g'), or even צִלְפָּחַד, cf. the form בְּצִלְעָל. Thus the name צִלְפָּחַד proves to be a theophorous name-form, meaning "the shadow of פָּחַד"; cf. Gen. 31.53, where פָּחַד is referred to as the god of Isaac.

Hebrew proper names are for the most part either nominative or verbal forms; sometimes a combination of both; cf. f. i. אַבִּימֶלֶךְ, אַבְשִׁלוֹם, יִבְחָר, יִזְרָח, פְּדֻחָאֵל, רִאוּבֵן. The study of the transliterations, may therefore, indicate how any given noun or verb was pronounced in that particular period.

Of Septuagint Mss. I have selected for this study the codices B and A (according to Henry B. Swete: *The Old Testament in*

Greek, 3 vols., Cambridge 1901 sq.), since they contain the most characteristic grammatical tendencies. In codex B there are preserved the oldest transliterated forms known to us, whereas in codex A we have the transition to the period of the Second Column (see paragraph V). It is well to note the frequent rendering of ח by χ (cf. חָבֵר χαβερ in B and αβερ in A, חֹפֶה χοφφα in B and οφφα in A), of י by σ (cf. אַחַז αχας in B and αχας in A, יֹרֵעַ ιορα in B and ιζρα in A), of long י by ει (cf. אֲבִי αβει in B and αβι in A, אֲחִי αχει in B and αχι in A) in codex B; cf. also paragraph XXVI on the Article. This estimate of the comparative age of the basic texts of these two codices is valid only if they are considered in their totality, but is no indication of the age of any particular transliteration. There are any number of forms in codex B which are late (cf. אֶפְסִי αψει and אֶרֶץ אֲרֵץ; זָכַר ζεχρει and זָמַח ζεμμα; אֲדָלִי אדלי), and correspondingly there are forms in codex A which are early (cf. חֹתֶם χωθαμ and חֶלֶק χελεκ; יָרִיב ιαρειβ and יָשִׁיב ιασειβ) (cf. ¶ XXXII). I have arranged my material in such a way that this is obvious in any particular instance. We can, therefore, apply here the statement which is elaborated in my *Septuagintaprobleme* (p. 46) to the effect that the uniformity of a given Ms. indicates nothing as to the uniformity of the Ms. from which it is derived, nor is there any possibility of determining the age of the basic text by ascribing the Ms. to any particular period.

V. ORIGEN'S HEXAPLA

For the Second Column of the Hexapla I used the citations in Fridericus Field: *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (2 vols., Oxford 1875) and the fragments discovered by Mercati (cf. Alfred Rahlfs: *Verzeichniss der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1914, p. 130 sq., under the symbol O. 39 sup.). These fragments have been printed by Franz X. Wutz in his commentary *Die Psalmen* (Munich 1925), but without any comment on them or even the slightest attempt to compare them with the corresponding text in Hebrew characters for the sake of mere textual criticism; cf. the final remarks in paragraph XXII. Fortunately I could verify his indications by reference

to Hatch and Redpath: *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Supplement, Oxford 1906, pp. 199–216). The understanding of these transliterations is made more difficult by the fact that very often words are rendered in forms that differ from those of the Masora; cf. Ps. 18.48: MT: וַיִּדְבֵּר Origen: ουιεδαββερ = וַיִּדְבֵּר; ib. 46.6: MT: וַיִּזְרֶה Origen: ουεζρα = וַיִּזְרֶה. In regard to the method of rendering Hebrew words, the transliterations of the Second Column agree for the most part with the system of codex A of the Septuagint, but not infrequently they agree with codex B. This leads to the conclusion that the Second Column is very definitely not a uniform text. In this connection compare the subdivisions a and b of the respective paragraphs in the section dealing with the verb, f. i. §3a and b, §27a and b, §53a and b for the perfect; §7a and b, §10a and b, §31a and b for the imperfect; §15a and b for the participle; §78 and §79 for the waw as waw conjunctivum and waw consecutivum; cf. similarly the paragraphs headed "Nouns with varying vocalization" in the section dealing with the noun, f. i. §§83 and 88 for the formation of the noun; §§115 and 116 for the article and §117 sq. for the inseparable prepositions בכלם. I had, therefore, originally attempted to arrange the material from the Hexapla in such a way as to enable me to assign the various fragments which have been discovered by Mercati to different textual types; f. i. s. v. בקר as a qutl-form (to use the Tiberian terminology) βoκp in Ps. 46.6 and as a qitl-form לבקר λαβεκp in Ps. 49.15; s. v. דרך as a qitl-form דרך δερχ in Ps. 89.42 and as a qatl-form דרכם δαρχαμ in Ps. 49.14; s. v. קרב as a qutl-form בקרב βεκορβ in Ps. 36.2; as a qitl-form בקרבה βκερβα in Ps. 46.6 and as a qatl-form קרבם καρβαμ in Ps. 49.12. But as a result of this investigation I realized that any such attempt must finally prove to be a failure, since the fragments represent already a mixed type. Compare, f. i., s. v. חפץ: the participle forms החפץ ααφης and חפצי ωφση, both occurring in the same verse (Ps. 35.27); s. v. יד: יד μαιδ and ידω ιδω, both in the same chapter (Ps. 89); cf. further the paragraphs cited above which deal with the different ways of verbal formations, the examples for which are taken in large part from the very same biblical chapter.

VI. JEROME'S ROLE

Numerically considered, the overwhelming majority of transliterated words is taken from St. Jerome. A glance at the arrangement of this study, in which instances are brought from Jerome for almost every subdivision of every paragraph, makes it evident that his transliterations must be based upon *Vorlagen* (originals) belonging to different periods. By merely external evidence, there are two main sources to which his references can be traced, namely the *Onomastica Sacra* which are merely a Latin transliteration of Greek texts, and his large Commentary to the various biblical books, where Jerome's own pronunciation of Hebrew or rather that of his Jewish teachers is given.

VII. THE ONOMASTICA SACRA GO BACK TO GREEK *VORLAGEN*

The *Onomastica Sacra* I have worked through in the edition of Lagarde (Goettingen 1887). When I had finished collecting my material from this source and sat down to classify it and to distribute the quotations to the various paragraphs where they belonged, I arrived at the conclusion that they are not genuine transliterations of Hebrew *Vorlagen*, but unquestionably go back to originals in Greek characters. How else could one account for the fact that he himself points out the divergencies between his transliteration and the corresponding Hebrew word? Cf. his remarks to עמרה, צער, and חם in paragraph VIII. I discussed this problem with a scholarly friend and he raised objections against my conclusion. To meet his objections I once again took up the study of the *Onomastica Sacra*, and this time I found there a plain statement of Jerome to this effect, which must have escaped my attention on previous occasions. This statement reads as follows (editio Lagarde, p. 26): "Philo, uir disertissimus Iudaeorum, Origenis quoque testimonio conprobatur edidisse librum hebraicorum nominum eorumque etymologias iuxta ordinem litterarum e latere copulasse. qui cum uulgo habeatur a Graecis, et bibliothecas orbis impleuerit, studii mihi fuit in latinam eum linguam uertere." Cf. also the headline on p. 156 of *Philonis*

Iudaei Alexandrini omnes quae apud Graecos et Latinos extant libri (Basileae, per Henricum Petrum, 1538) reading: "Divi Hieronymi Presbyteri in librum Philonis Iudaei de nominibus Hebraicis praefatio." This work, thus ascribed to Philo, is only Pseudo-Philonic; cf. Leopold Cohn; *Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos*, VII. Supplementband des *Philologus* (Leipzig 1899, p. 426) and at full length Franz Wutz: *Onomastica Sacra*, I, Leipzig 1914, §2.

VIII. THE PRONUNCIATION OF ך AND ף HAD CHANGED

The transliteration of the Greek *Vorlagen* of the *Onomastica Sacra* into Latin characters is the best indication of the exactness and punctiliousness of Jerome. In spite of the fact that the pronunciation of Hebrew had changed materially between the time of the writing of the Greek originals and the period of Jerome, and despite the fact that Jerome himself was fully aware of the incongruities between the transliteration and the contemporary pronunciation of Hebrew, he made no attempt to avoid these discrepancies by means of corrections, but rather reproduced his originals faithfully and limited himself to mere glosses. Thus he remarks while explaining the name עֲמֹרָה (ed. Lagarde, p. 33): "Gomorra populi timor (this would mean: עָם and מֹרָא) siue seditio (probably: עָם and מֹרָה, cf. Deut. 21.18: יִמְרָה), sciendum quod G litteram in hebraico non habet, sed scribitur per uocalem ף." Similarly he notes to צֶעַר (ib. in the Genesis list of names beginning with S): "Segor parua (cf. Gen. 19.20). ipsa est quae et supra Seor. sed sciendum quia G litteram in medio non habeat, scribaturque apud Hebraeos per uocalem ain." As regards this inconsistency in transliterating Hebrew words (Segor and Seor) cf. Jerome's preface (ed. Lagarde, p. 26). "uerum tam dissona inter se exemplaria repperi et sic confusum ordinem, ut tacere melius indicauerim quam reprehensione quid dignum scribere."

On the name חָם Jerome remarks (ib., p. 30): "Cham calidus. sed sciendum quod in hebraeo ח (this corresponds to "ch" in Jerome's transliteration; cf. paragraph X) litteram non habeat,

scribitur autem per ה, quae duplici adspiratione profertur.” He speaks at greater length concerning the question of transliterating the ה in his *Quaestiones hebraicae in libro Geneseos* to Gen. 9.18: “frequenter LXX interpretes, non ualentes heth literam quae duplicem aspirationem sonat, in graecum sermonem uertere, chi graecam literam addiderunt, ut nos docerent in istius modi uocabulis aspirare debere: unde et in praesenti loco Cham transtulerunt, pro eo quod est Ham, a quo et Aegyptus usque hodie Aegyptiorum lingua dicitur.”

This manifests what Jerome understood by the duplex aspiratio: an H. His explanation of the fact that ה is transliterated in the older texts by χ, is hardly correct. On the contrary, such transliterations clearly indicate that ה had then the consonantal value of χ. But when in the period of the Second Column ה became merely a vowel, no change was made in the transliterations of proper names which were utilized in the current texts. That Jerome's explanation is not based upon any well founded tradition, but rather upon his own fancy, is demonstrated by the inconsistent manner in which he himself transliterates ה one time with an h and another time simply as a vowel; cf. for instance: חדלו hedalu, חרש hodes as compared with: חלד eled, חנף oneph; even the same Hebrew word is transliterated in different places in different ways, cf. חמר omer and homer, חרב areb and hareb, חרוץ arus and harus. Moreover, even his transliteration of ה by h fails to satisfy completely his own demands for a double aspirate, since h according to him is only a simple aspirate; cf. *Onomastica Sacra*, p. 51: “H autem a plerisque adspiratio putatur esse, non littera.” Accordingly Jerome transliterates the ה—in so far as he deals with it not simply as a vowel—equally by h; so for instance in his *Quaestiones* on Gen. 14.5: “porro BAHEM, pro quo dixerunt (namely: the Septuagint) μετ' αὐτοῖς (hoc est cum eis) putauerunt scribi per ה, ducti elementi similitudine, cum per heth scriptum sit. BAHEM enim cum per tres literas scribitur, si mediam he habet, interpretatur in eis, si autem heth (ut in praesenti) locum significat, id est Hom.” As to the fact that Jerome read בהם here instead of the Masoretic spelling בהם, cf. paragraph XVII.

IX. THE *VORLAGEN* BELONG TO DIFFERENT TYPES

It is, therefore, explicable that Jerome sometimes renders the same Hebrew name forms, occurring in the various biblical books or even in the same book, differently; f. i. אחי *achi* and *ahi*, זבדי *zabdi* and *zebdi*, זמרי *zamri* and *zemer*, מלכי *melchi* and *malchi*. It is obvious that his *Vorlagen* could not have been parts of a uniform tradition. This fact was naturally taken into consideration in the arrangement of the material utilized in this study; note for instance the order in which the transliterations are cited for אחז: $\alpha\chi\alpha\zeta$, *achaz*— $aa\zeta$, *aaz*; or for מעון: $\mu\alpha\omega\nu$, *maon*— $\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$, *meon*. Jerome himself definitely indicates these various possibilities of pronunciation (*editio Vallarsi*, vol. VI, p. 24C on Hos. 2.18): “בעלי. inter Beth et Lamed literas consonantes Ain uocalis litera ponitur, quae iuxta linguae illius proprietatem nunc BEEL, nunc BAAL legitur.”

X. HOW TO RECONSTRUCT THE ORIGINAL GREEK

One can reconstruct without any difficulty the Greek originals of Jerome's rendering of the Hebrew name lists in the *Onomastica Sacra*, when we keep in mind that the following are the Greek equivalents of his Latin characters: $a=\alpha$, $b=\beta$, $c=\kappa$, $ch=\chi$, $d=\delta$, $e=\epsilon$ or η , $f=\varphi$, $g=\gamma$, i and $j=\iota$, $l=\lambda$, $m=\mu$, $n=\nu$, $o=o$ or ω , $p=\pi$, $ph=\varphi$, $r=\rho$, $s=\sigma$, $t=\tau$, $th=\theta$, $u=ou$, $z=\zeta$. If our conjecture be correct, Jerome has permitted himself only one major deviation from the normal Greek spelling; that is between two vowels immediately following one another he inserts an *h* to indicate that they are to be pronounced separately; so for instance (in the name lists of the *Genesis* and of *Exodus* in the *Onomastica Sacra*): ישראל *Israhel*, בצלאל *Beselehel*, ימואל *Iamuhel*, מישאל *Misahel*, רעואל *Raguhel*, בעל פעור *Behelfegor*, בעל צפון *Behelsefon*, בעל מעון *Bahalmeon*. Compare also the passage in *Quaestiones* on Gen. 17.3, cited in paragraph XI, which states that by adding an *a* to the name Abram it became Abraham; the *h* inserted between the two *a*'s does not count. Cases like אהר *aher* (cf. $\alpha\epsilon\rho$ B), נחלה *nehela* (cf. $\nu\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\alpha\chi$ O), מרהם *merehem* (cf. $\mu\eta\rho\epsilon\mu$ O) have, therefore, to be treated similarly; an assumption that the *h* here corresponds to the Hebrew ה, would be unjustified.

XI. THE GRECO-LATIN ALPHABETS INADEQUATE FOR TRANSLITERATION

Jerome was quite aware of the incompatibility of the Latin and Greek alphabets for rendering Hebrew sounds, insofar as the Greco-Latin alphabets have for one thing no exact equivalents for Semitic Gutturals or Sybillants. So he prefaces the list from Genesis with the following remark (p. 27): "Non statim, ubicumque ex A littera, quae apud Hebraeos dicitur aleph, ponuntur nomina, aestimandum est ipsam esse solam quae ponitur. nam interdum ex ain, saepe ex he, non numquam ex heth litteris, quae adspirationes suas uocesque commutant, habent exordium. sciendum igitur quod tam in Genesi quam ceteris in libris, ubi a uocali littera nomen incipit, apud Hebraeos a diuersis (ut supra diximus) incohetur elementis, sed quia apud nos non est uocum tanta diuersitas, simplici sumus elatione contenti. unde accidit ut eadem uocabula, quae apud illos non similiter scripta sunt, nobis uideantur in interpretatione uariari." This general statement Jerome further elucidates in discussing the changes in the name forms of אברהם—אברם and שרי—שרה in Quaestiones on Gen. 17.3: "dicunt autem Hebraei quod ex nomine suo deus, quod apud illos tetragrammum est, he literam Abrahae et Sarae addiderit: dicebatur enim primum Abram, quod interpretatur pater excelsus (this means: composed of אב and רם) et postea uocatus est Abraham, quod transfertur pater multarum (i. e. אב and רמון): nam quod sequitur, gentium, non habetur in nomine, sed subauditur. nec mirandum quare, cum apud Graecos et nos A litera uideatur addita, nos he literam hebraeam additam dixerimus: idioma enim linguae illius est, per E quidem scribere, sed per A legere: sicut e contrario A literam saepe per E pronuntiant." This conception is rounded out in his explanation to Gen. 17.15: "Sarai igitur primum uocata est per sin res ioth: sublata ergo ioth, id est I elemento, addita est he litera, quae per A legitur, et uocata est Saraa. causa autem ita nominis immutati haec est, quod antea dicebatur princeps mea, unius tantum modo domus mater familiae, postea uero dicitur absolute princeps, id est ἀρχουσα."

XII. GUTTURALS

Gutturals have, therefore, no independent consonantal value, but serve merely to carry the vowel sign. This yields a double conclusion: when two different Gutturals bear the same vowel signs we can have the result that two entirely distinct words may be pronounced identically and consequently be identical in transliteration. An example for such a case we find in *Quaestiones* to Gen. 30.13: "Aser ergo non diuitiae, sed beatus dicitur, dum taxat in praesenti loco. nam in aliis secundum ambiguitatem uerbi possunt et diuitiae sic uocari." The two Hebrew words Jerome refers to here, are: אָסֵר and עָשִׂיר. Similarly he explains in his *Onomastica Sacra* (p. 36) רַעְמָה Gen. 10.7: "Rama tonans uel excelsa," i. e. רַעְמָה (from רָעַם thunder) and רֶאֱמָה (from רוֹם; cf. Zech. 14.10: וְרֶאֱמָה). But on the other hand, when the same Guttural appears in two etymologically different words with identical spelling, and the Guttural has different vowels, then the transliterations fail to indicate the identical consonantal spelling in the original Hebrew. So Jerome remarks in *Quaestiones* on Gen. 26.12: "licet enim eiusdem literis et aestimatio scribatur et hordeum, tamen aestimationes SAARIM leguntur, hordea uero SORIM," Jerome thinks here of שָׂעִיר and שָׂעִירִים.

XIII. SYBILLANTS

Concerning the difficulty of rendering Hebrew Sybillants, Jerome discourses in his introduction to those explanations coming under the letter S (*Onomastica*, p. 36): "Quod in principio dixeramus in uocalibus litteris obseruandum eo, quod apud nos una sit interdum littera et apud Hebraeos uariis uocibus proferatur, hoc nunc quoque in s littera sciendum est. siquidem apud Hebraeos tres s sunt litterae: una, quae dicitur samech, et simpliciter legitur quasi per s nostram litteram describatur: alia sin, in qua stridor quidam non nostri sermonis interstrepit: tertia sade, quam aures nostrae penitus reformidant. sicubi ergo euenerit ut eadem nomina aliter atque aliter interpretentur, illud in causa est quod diuersis scripta sunt litteris." In another place (*editio Vallarsi*, vol. IV, p. 155E) Jerome nevertheless attempts to

explain the pronunciation of the צ: "וצר. Sed sciendum quod hic NESER per SADE litteram scribatur: cuius proprietatem et sonum inter z et s Latinus sermo non exprimit. Est enim stridulus et strictis dentibus vix linguae impressione profertur."

Due to the circumstance that in the Greek and Latin alphabets the three Hebrew letters ס, צ and ש can be rendered only by one character (σ, s), there results the situation in which two entirely different words are identical in transliteration. When the opportunity presents itself, Jerome himself indicates this; so for instance (Onomastica, p. 53): "Aser beatus, si per aleph et sin litteram scribitur; sin autem per heth et sade, atrium interpretatur." Jerome has in mind: אֶסֶר and הָצֵר.

XIV. ש AND שׁ

From the passages of the Onomastica Sacra cited above and from all those other passages in which Jerome attempts to explain the pronunciation and transliteration of Semitic Sybillants (cf. especially Quaestiones on Gen. 26.12; 41.29), it is obvious that for him the ש had but one sound: sin. He is unfamiliar with the differentiation between ש and שׁ. In this connection cf. Jud. 12.6: in Ephraim (i. e. the klngdom of Israel) the ש had the same consonantal value as שׁ. Later on, maybe due to the inclusion of parts of Israel into the kingdom of Judah after the destruction of Samaria, (cf. Rudolf Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 5. Auflage, Gotha 1922, p. 473 note 1 and p. 482 note 2, also the references cited there) we meet with this phenomenon even in Judah; cf., f.i., Jer. 23.38, 39: וְאִם מִשָּׁא יְהוָה תֹּאמְרוּ . . . וְנִשְׁכַּח אֶתְכֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ. a play on words: מִשָּׁא from the root נָשָׂא, with the verb נִשְׁכַּח to forget, cf. Lam. 3.17 (tertiaie ה and נ are promiscuously used in that late period). Cf. also Talmud babli Šabbat 9a: הלא פרוש לרעב (Isa. 58.7) לחמך בש"ן כתיב (ib. 55b) on the passage: ובספרים שלנו כתיב בס"ן. Cf. also paragraph XXXIII 2. In the alphabetical arrangement of the word list beginning with ש I have therefore not considered the fact, whether according to the Tiberian grammatical system this sign is pronounced ש or שׁ, but have followed the conception of Jerome.

XV. JEROME'S COMMENTARIES ARE BASED UPON
THE HEBREW TEXT

Jerome's Commentaries I have gone through in the edition of Vallarsi (Venice 1767 sq.); for the *Quaestiones hebraicae in libro Geneseos* I used also Lagarde's edition (Leipzig 1868). Whereas the *Onomastica Sacra*, considered as a unit, undoubtedly render Hebrew pronunciations as they were known before the time of Jerome, since they agree for the most part with codex A and frequently even with codex B, in the transliterations which appear in his commentaries we have a *mixtum compositum*, which includes, it is true, old material but at the same time a great deal that is purely contemporary; cf., f. i., ברורה *barura* (§19a) against דרושה *drusa* (§19c); בח *bath* and *beth* (§83); שרף *saraph* and *seraph* (§93); הרים *ares* and *heres*; (§96); עגור *agor* and *agur* (§109); אסעד *asedec* and אסדמות *asademoth* (§115) against אגוי *aggoi* and אמלך *ammelech* (§116); מבתן *mebeten* and מקדם *mecedem* (§121a) against מבית *mebbeth* and מכנה *mecchenaph* (§122); בסופה *basupha* and בקרב *bacereb* (§117a) against בגוים *baggoim* and בפרך *baphphuch* (§120). This results from the fact that Jerome in his commentaries has not limited himself to a mere explanation of the text offered by the Septuagint but has consulted the Hebrew text in every instance. This Hebrew text which he utilized must have consisted of unvocalized consonants (as was already pointed out by Wilhelm Nowack: *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik*, Göttingen 1875, p. 55), since he frequently calls attention to the various possibilities for the pronunciation of the consonantal word; so for instance (editio Vallarsi, vol. IV, p. 856E): "רעים. Verbum enim REIM, quod quattuor literis scribitur RES, AIN, JOD, MEM, et amatores et pastores utrumque significat. Et si legamus REIM, amatores significat; si ROIM, pastores;" this means: רעים and רעים. He has also noticed that various Hebrew characters are sufficiently similar to be confused; note for instance his remark (ib., vol. VI, p. 818AB): "oculum eorum, quod Hebraice dicitur ENAM, et scribitur per AIN, JOD, NUN, MEM. Sive iniquitatem eorum; quae si per VAV literam scripta esset, recte

legeretur ONAM, ut LXX putaverunt"; the two words referred to are: נָּוֶה and נָּוֶה .

In basing his work upon the original Hebrew text of the Bible, Jerome must have performed a task, which in his time was a mark of unusual scholarly achievement. Otherwise he would not have called special attention to this fact (ib., vol. V, p. 239): "Accedit ad hanc dictandi difficultatem, quod caligantibus oculis senectute et aliquid sustinentibus beati Isaac, ad nocturnum lumen nequaquam valeamus Hebraeorum volumina relegere, quae etiam ad solis dieique fulgorem literarum nobis parvitate caecantur." In instances, where Jerome felt doubtful as to his conception of the meaning of particular passages of the Bible, he followed the practice of turning to a Jew for advice and guidance; and in his explanations he calls attention to this procedure; so for instance (ib., vol. IV, p. 172A): "Hebraeus, quo ego praeceptore usus sum," or (ib., vol. VI, p. 288D; cf. also ib., pp. 383C, 550A, 570A, 637D): "Hebraeus autem, qui nos in Scripturis sanctis erudit." In particularly difficult passages he was not satisfied with one such consultation, but would seek the advice of several Jews; note the plural for instance in the remark (ib., vol. VI, p. 808AB): "quid videatur Hebraeis, a quibus in veteri Testamento eruditi sumus."

XVI. UNCERTAINTY OF ETYMOLOGY

These Jews who served as sources of information for Jerome and whom he so respectfully calls his teachers, must have been considered in their time authorities in matters of biblical exegesis; otherwise he would not have turned particularly to them for instruction. Consequently it is all the more interesting to read an answer like the following to one of his questions (ib., vol. VI, p. 934BC on Zech. 14.20 נִלְחָף): "Verbum Hebraicum MESULOTH (this question implies that Jerome vocalized the word as נִלְחָף ; cf. ib. 10.11), Aquila et Theodotio $\beta\upsilon\theta\acute{o}\nu$ interpretati sunt, id est profundum; Symmachus περίπατον σύσκιον , id est incessum umbrosum. Soli Septuaginta $\chi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron$, id est frenum, transtulerunt; quos et nos in hoc loco sequuti sumus, ne novum aliquid in quaestione vulgata videremus afferre. Quod quum ab

Hebraeo quaererem quid significaret, ait mihi, non debere nos legere MESULOTH sed MESALOTH (i. e. מֶסָלוֹת; cf. Jer. 8.16; 13.27. The word is, therefore, not a ἄραξ λεγόμενον, as Jerome says.), quod significat phaleras equorum et ornatum bellicum et excepto hoc loco, in nullo penitus sanctarum Scripturarum volumine hoc verbum reperi.

Such suggestions indicate clearly that the Hebrew text of the Bible itself, even in passages where Jerome's consonantal text is identical with our *textus receptus*, could at that time be read very differently from the vocalization to which we are accustomed as a result of the activities of the Tiberian school of grammarians. Both the pronunciation and the etymological derivation of Hebrew words were at that time to a large extent decidedly uncertain, as Jerome himself frequently remarks; for instance in Quaestiones to Gen. 48.2: "ipsum uerbum METTA, quod hic in lectulum transtulerunt, supra . . . uirgam potius quam lectulum nominauerunt"; i. e. מֵטָה and מֵטָה. Similarly to Gen. 21.31: "septem enim dicuntur SABEE . . . et iuramentum SABEE similiter appellatur," as compared with his assertion to Gen. 41.29: "uerbum hebraicum SABEE . . . abundantiam siue satietatem . . . interpretati sumus," i. e. שָׂבַע, שְׂבוּעָה and שָׂבַע. This explanation Jerome repeats in his commentary (editio Vallarsi, vol. IV, pp. 64E and 945E): "licet iuxta Hebraei sermonis ambiguitatem, qui uerbum SABA, nunc septem, nunc plures, nunc iuramentum, interpretantur."

XVII. VARIANTS AGAINST MT

But even in respect to the consonantal text the tradition was fluctuating and uncertain, a fact which did not escape the attention of Jerome. Thus he remarks on Hab. 2.19 (ib., vol. VI, p. 630BC): "וכל־רוח. Unde et Aquila significantius vertit Hebraicum dicens: Et spiritus eius non est in visceribus sive in medio eius. Propterea sciendum in quibusdam Hebraicis voluminibus non esse additum omnis, sed absolute spiritum legi"; these Mss. had, according to this statement, the reading: רוח. In this connection it is interesting to indicate the fact that in the large collections of textual variations by Kennicott (*Vetus*

Testamentum cum variis lectionibus, 2 vols., Oxford 1776 and 1780), de Rossi (*Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti*, 4 vols., Parma 1784–88), and Ginsburg (*The Old Testament . . . with the various readings from Mss.*, London 1926) there are still evidences for such non-Masoretic readings of Jerome:

Gen. 14.5: בָּהֶם; Jerome: בָּהֶם (cf. paragraph VIII); 7 Mss. de Rossi.

Isa. 29.4: בָּאוּב; Jerome: בָּאוּב; 2 Mss. Kennicott.

Ezek. 29.10: מְגִדֵּל; Jerome: מְגִדֵּל; 5 Mss. Ginsburg.

Ezek. 46.23: טִירוֹת; Jerome: טִירוֹת; 1 Ms. Kennicott.

Micah 5.3: יָשׁוּבוּ; Jerome: יָשׁוּבוּ; 1 Ms. Kennicott, 2 Mss. de Rossi, 1 Ms. Ginsburg.

Zech. 12.5: אֶמְצָא; Jerome: אֶמְצָא; 2 Mss. de Rossi.

XVIII. ORIGEN'S HEBREW TEXT DIFFERS FROM MT, TOO

A further indication of the importance of these collections of variants is the fact that they frequently substantiate the deviations from Masoretic readings which are already found in the Second Column of Origen's Hexapla:

Ps. 30.4: מִן שְׂאוֹל; Origen: מִשְׂאוֹל; 4 Mss. Kennicott, 2 Mss. Ginsburg.

Ps. 31.25: חֲזָקוֹ; Origen: חֲזָק; 1 Ms. Kennicott.

Ps. 31.25: הַמִּיחִלִּים; Origen: הַמִּיחִלִּים; 2 Mss. Ginsburg.

Ps. 35.1: לָחֶם; Origen: לָחֶם; 1 Ms. Kennicott.

Ps. 35.25: בִּלְבָבָם; Origen: בִּלְבָבָם; 4 Mss. Kennicott.

Ps. 36.2: לִבִּי; Origen: לִבּוֹ; 2 Mss. Kennicott, 4 Mss. de Rossi, 1 Ms. Ginsburg.

Ps. 76.10: עָנִי; Origen: עָנִי; 1 Ms. Kennicott.

Ps. 89.36: בִּקְדָּשִׁי; Origen: בִּקְדָּשׁ; 1 Ms. Kennicott.

Ps. 89.47: תִּסְתֵּיר; Origen: תִּסְתִּיר; 5 Mss. Kennicott.

The establishment of this fact is all the more important, since these collections are based on relatively late Hebrew Bible Mss. which otherwise follow almost entirely the Tiberian school. How numerous and wide-spread must have been such *variae lectiones* in the time of the transliterations, if in spite of the

unifying activities of the Masorites of Tiberias, remnants of such readings could have been preserved in Mss. dating from a period possibly a thousand years later than that of the transliterations; see also my article "Targum Onkelos in its relation to the Hebrew Masoretic text," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, vol. VI, 1934/5, p. 312 seq.

XIX. JEROME TRANSLATES WORDS, REGARDLESS OF THE CONTEXT

Attention has already been called to Jerome's commentary on Zech. 14.20 (paragraph XVI), where the explanation of the difficult word מצליח was referred to a Jew, who indicated the various possibilities of reading it. It is interesting that no attempt was made to explain this word so as to fit in its context. It was sufficient that the single word should be explained. This is not the only instance for such a procedure in Jerome. On the contrary, it is obvious from the manner both of the question and the answer that only single words and not the sense of the passages were the subjects of his inquiry. It made little difference at that time whether the words so explained fitted into the passages or not. We are thus in a position to understand how it could come about that sometimes the Septuagint offers translations of separate words based upon a vocalization of the Hebrew consonants, which in itself is quite possible, but which fails to make sense in the context. I have already brought instances of such renderings (see my articles "Das Alphabet der Septuaginta-Vorlage," *OLZ* 1929, p. 533 sq. and "The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions," *JBL* 1935, p. 82, paragraph II), and may I at this point add the following:

1 Sam. 11.5: הַבָּקָר; LXX: τὸ πρωῒ = הַבָּקָר.

Isa. 26.14: וְכַר; LXX: ἄρσεν = וְכַר.

Isa. 55.1: וְחֵלֶב; LXX: στέαρ = וְחֵלֶב.

Jer. 6.23: בָּאֵשׁ; LXX: ὡς πῦρ = בָּאֵשׁ.

Jer. 6.23: וְאֵנֶשׁ; LXX: ἄνθρωπος = וְאֵנֶשׁ.

Jer. 18.14: שָׂרִי; LXX: μαστοί = שָׂרִי.

Ezek. 16.30: לִבְרָתָהּ; LXX: τὴν θυγατέρα σου = לִבְרָתָהּ.

Ezek. 24.17: דָּם; LXX: αἷματος = דָּם.

Ezek. 26.10: מִבְּקָעָהּ; LXX: ἐκ πεδίου = מִבְּקָעָהּ.

Ezek. 34.3: הַחֲלָב; LXX: τὸ γάλα = הַחֲלָב.

Translations of this kind are generally referred to as obvious misconceptions; and there can hardly be any disagreement on this point. But it is a very important problem, whether they really originate in erroneous readings of the then undoubtedly unvocalized text. Going through the few instances which we have just listed, we note that in Isa. 55.1 the Septuagint misunderstood חֲלָב as חֲמֶלֶב, while in Ezek. 34.3 vice versa חֲמֶלֶב was misconceived as חֲלָב. These two facts combined advocate the assumption that in that early period חֲלָב milk and חֲמֶלֶב fat were similarly pronounced and could thus be confused with each other. The same may have been the case with זָכָר and זָכָר (Isa. 26.14); cf., f. i., our remarks on רָשָׁע and רָשָׁע in paragraph XXV; and in regard to שָׂרִי and שָׂרִי (Jer. 18.14), the explanation offered in paragraph XIV is of similar nature. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that mistranslations of this kind may largely be due not so much to a mistaken reading of the word in question as to a faulty etymology; cf. the similar case from b. Sanh. 5b, dealt with in paragraph XXXI. Bearing this in mind we may now try to solve some similar vexing problems: The word רַפָּאִים is rendered by the Septuagint with γιγάντες; cf. Isa. 14.9; Job 26.5. However, in two passages, namely Isa. 26.14 and Ps. 88.11 they translate it: ἰατροί; this would correspond to a vocalization of the word as רַפָּאִים. Needless to emphasize that a meaning "healers" is quite out of place in these two verses. It is, therefore, all the more interesting to note that Jerome in the Deuteronomy Name List of his Onomastica Sacra (p. 51) remarks: "Raphaim medici uel gigantes." We have now to dispense with any attempt to explain the translation ἰατροί as based upon a mere mistake in the pronunciation, but have to admit that, speaking in the terms of the Tiberian Hebrew grammar, רַפָּאִים shades and רַפָּאִים healers were similarly pronounced at least until Jerome's days. With the results of this study in mind we can easily account for it: 1) רַפָּאִים raphaim meaning: shades.

The Tiberian nominal plural form רָפְאִים presupposes a singular רָפָא, just as דְּבָרִים is the plural of דְּבַר. In paragraph XXVIa we will show that according to the system of the transliterations, the plur. masc. is formed by merely adding *im* to the noun without its undergoing any phonetic change as is the case in the Tiberian system. Thus, f. i., *θαμαρ* תָּמַר is in the plural: thamarim; accordingly, to the sing. רָפָא rapha, shade, corresponds a plural רָפְאִים raphaim. 2) רָפְאִים raphaim meaning: healers. The Tiberian Hebrew grammar vocalizes רָפָא healer as a participle to רָפָא. But there is no reason why it should not be pronounced as a nominal form רָפָא like f. i. נָבִי (from נָבֵא) or רָכֵב (from רָכַב). Now, in the Tiberian grammar, pataḥ is a short vowel and can not stand in an open syllable; the dagesh is therefore put in the immediately following consonant (נ and כ respectively) to close the preceding syllable with the pataḥ. But this rule does not hold true for the transliteration system; cf., f. i., in §80 the following plural forms without the gemination of the second radical, as required by the Tiberian grammar: s. v. גָּל: γαλειμ; s. v. יָם: ιαμιμ; s. v. רֵב: ραβιμ; s. v. עָם: αμιμ. We may thus assume a nominal singular form רָפָא rapha healer, to which the plural according to paragraph XXVIa would be: raphaim. On the Tiberian pluralis fractus רָפְאִים or דְּבָרִים see the discussion of שְׂרָפִים at the end of paragraph XXVIa.

XX. BEGINNINGS OF ETYMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATION

The variants on the Masoretic text as found in the transliterations belong to a certain extent to this category of words, being theoretically possible, but out of context in the particular passage. Such renderings are, therefore, impossible, not only because they fail to make sense in the context, which in those days was a matter of little importance as evidenced by the examples brought from the Septuagint, but also because they are etymologically unsound. However, an etymological sense was foreign to the contemporaries of Jerome; cf. his statement in Quaestiones on Gen. 17.16: "quidam pessime suspicantur ante eam lepram fuisse uocitatum et postea principem: cum lepra SARATH dicatur, quae in nostra quidem lingua uidetur aliquam habere

similitudinem, in hebraeo autem penitus est diuersa. scribitur enim per SADE et AIN et RES et THAU: quod multum a superioribus tribus literis, id est SIN, RES et HE, quibus SARAA scribitur, discrepare manifestum est." If one could think of an etymological connection between צרעת and שרה, so that Jerome found it necessary to call attention to the different spelling of the two words in order to refute such an interpretation, it must be readily admitted that at that time etymological considerations played a very small role, indeed, in biblical exegesis.

XXI. TRACING BACK OF JEROME'S MISTAKES

The evidence for the various readings of the transliterations, which was brought from the Tiberian Bible Mss., indicates how long such variants were still current. On the other hand we can see from the agreement of the Septuagint with some of these variants that such texts are much older than the time when they were committed to writing by Origen and Jerome, since they served in part as *Vorlagen* for the Septuagint itself. For instance:

Gen. 26.12: שָׁעָרִים; Jerome: שְׁעָרִים; LXX: κριθῆν.

Jer. 18.3: אֲבָנִים; Jerome: אֲבָנִים; LXX: τῶν λίθων.

Ezek. 23.23: פָּקוֹד; Jerome: פָּקוֹד; LXX (3 Mss.): Φακούδ.

Ezek. 40.21: תָּאֵי; Jerome: תָּאֵי; LXX: θεέ.

Amos 5.26: סִכּוֹת; Jerome: סִכּוֹת; LXX: τὴν σκηνην.

Hag. 1.11: חֶרֶב; Jerome: חֶרֶב; LXX: ῥομφαίαν.

Zech. 2.7: יָצָא; Jerome: יָצָא; LXX: ἰσθῆκει (tempus!).

Zech. 12.5: אֶמְצָא; Jerome: אֶמְצָא; LXX: εὐρήσομεν.

Mal. 2.13: מִדִּיכֶם; Origen: מִדִּיכֶם; LXX: ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

Ps. 18.37: צָעָדִי; Origen: צָעָדִי; LXX: τὰ διαβήματά μου.

Ps. 36.2: לִבִּי; Origen: לִבִּי; LXX: ἐν ἐαυτῷ.

Ps. 46.3: אֶרֶץ; Origen: אֶרֶץ; LXX: τὴν γῆν.

XXII. VARIAE LECTIONES OF ORIGEN AND JEROME

For the benefit of the biblical scholar who is interested in textual criticism, I consider it worth while to give here a full list of the variae lectiones of Origen and Jerome as compared with the Masoretic Hebrew text, based upon their transliterations of the

words in question. These transliterations are scattered all over the third part of this monograph, the Dictionary, and can be looked up there sub voce. Here I arrange them according to the order of the biblical books. Those variants, which have been dealt with in the preceding paragraphs, will be noted with a reference to the respective paragraph. The Variants from the Septuagint and the Onomastica Sacra referring to the pronunciation of Hebrew Proper Names, will easily be found with the help of the Alphabetical Index at the end of this monograph.

Gen. 14.5: בָּהֶם; cf. paragraph XVII.

Gen. 26.12: שָׁעִרִים; cf. paragraph XXI.

2 Ki. 23.7: הַקִּדְשִׁים; Origen: הַקִּדְשִׁים.

Isa. 7.14: קָרְאֵת; Jerome: קָרְאֵת.

Isa. 8.21: וּבִאלֹהֵיו; Origen: וּבִאלֹהֵיו.

Isa. 24.16: וְמֵרֶחַ; Jerome: וְמֵרֶחַ.

Isa. 26.3: יִצָּר; Origen: יִצָּרוּ.

Isa. 26.10: רָשָׁע; Jerome: רָשָׁע; cf. paragraph XXV.

Isa. 29.4: כְּאוֹב; cf. paragraph XVII.

Isa. 38.10: דָּמִי; Jerome: דָּמִי.

Isa. 46.3: מִנִּי בֶטֶן; Jerome: מִבֶּטֶן.

Isa. 46.3: מִנִּי רֶחֶם; Jerome: מִרְחֶם.

Isa. 62.4: שִׁמְשָׁמָה; Jerome: שִׁמְשָׁמָה.

Jer. 4.19: הָקָה; Jerome: הָקָה.

Jer. 5.8: מְשַׁכִּים; Jerome: מְשַׁכִּים.

Jer. 5.26: יָשׁוּר; Jerome: יָשִׁיר.

Jer. 13.16: נִשְׁפָּה; Jerome: נִשְׁפָּה.

Jer. 18.3: אֶבְגִּים; cf. paragraph XXI.

Jer. 23.6: צִדְקָנוּ; Jerome: צִדְקָנוּ.

Ezek. 1.14: בָּזֶק; Jerome: בָּזֶק.

Ezek. 7.23: קִרְחֹק; Jerome: קִרְחִיק.

Ezek. 23.23: פָּקִיד; cf. paragraph XXI.

Ezek. 29.10: מְגִדֹל; cf. paragraph XVII.

Ezek. 30.17: אֵוֶן; Jerome: אֵוֶן.

Ezek. 40.16: תְּמָרִים; Jerome: תְּמָרִים.

Ezek. 40.16: אֶטְמוֹת; Jerome: אֶטְמוֹת.

Ezek. 40.21: תָּאֵו; cf. paragraph XXI.

- Ezek. 40.24: אֵילִם; Jerome: אולם.
 Ezek. 46.23: טִירוֹת; cf. paragraph XVII.
 Hos. 9.7: יָדָעוּ; Jerome: יָדְעוּ.
 Hos. 11.1: נֶאֱהָבְהוּ; Origen: נֶאֱהָבְהוּ.
 Hos. 12.5: יִשָּׁר; Jerome: יִשָּׁר.
 Amos 4.12: הִכִּין; Jerome: הִכִּין.
 Amos 5.26: סִכּוֹת; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Amos 7.1: גָּזִי; Jerome: גָּזִי.
 Mic. 5.3: יָשְׁבוּ; cf. paragraph XVII.
 Hab. 1.5: רָאוּ; Jerome: רָאוּ.
 Hab. 1.11: וְאָשָׁם; Jerome: וְאָשָׁם.
 Hab. 3.13: לִישׁוּעָה; Jerome: לִישׁוּעָה.
 Zeph. 1.5: מְלָכִים; Jerome: מְלָכִים.
 Hag. 1.11: חָרֵב; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Zech. 2.7: יָצָא; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Zech. 8.14: נִחַמְתִּי; Jerome: נִחַמְתִּי.
 Zech. 12.5: אֶמְצָה; cf. paragraph XVII and XXI.
 Zech. 14.20: מִצּוֹלוֹת; Jerome: מִצּוֹלוֹת and מִצְהָלוֹת.
 Mal. 2.13: פָּנוּת; Origen: פָּנוּת.
 Mal. 2.13: מִידָכָם; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Ps. 1.1: רִשְׁעִים; Origen: רִשְׁעִים.
 Ps. 7.15: יִחְבֹּל; Origen: יִחְבֹּל.
 Ps. 9.1: לִבִּי; Origen: לִבִּי.
 Ps. 9.1: עַל מוֹת; Jerome: עַל מוֹת.
 Ps. 9.7: הִרְבּוֹת; Origen: הִרְבּוֹת.
 Ps. 9.7: הֵם; Origen: הֵם.
 Ps. 12.9: כָּרָם; Origen: כָּרָם.
 Ps. 18.32: מְבַלְעָדִי; Origen: מְבַלְעָדִי.
 Ps. 18.33: הִמְאֹרֵנִי; Origen: הִמְאֹרֵנִי.
 Ps. 18.35: וְנִחַמְתָּה; Origen: וְנִחַמְתָּה.
 Ps. 18.35: וְרוּעַתִּי; Origen: וְרוּעַתִּי.
 Ps. 18.37: צַעֲדִי; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Ps. 18.37: מִתְחִי; Origen: מִתְחִי.
 Ps. 18.40: וְתִאֲוָרֵנִי; Origen: וְתִאֲוָרֵנִי.
 Ps. 18.41: וּמִשְׁנָאִי; Origen: וּמִשְׁנָאִי.
 Ps. 18.48: וְיִדְבֹּר; Origen: וְיִדְבֹּר.
 Ps. 28.6: שָׁמַע; Origen: שָׁמַע.

- Ps. 28.9: וְרַעַם; Origen: וְהָרִם.
 Ps. 30.4: מִן שְׂאוּל; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 30.13: יָדָם; Origen: יָדוֹם.
 Ps. 30.13: אֹדְרָה; Origen: אֹדְרָה.
 Ps. 31.8: וְאֶשְׁמַח; Origen: וְאֶשְׁמַח.
 Ps. 31.21: מְרִיב; Origen: מְרִיבִי.
 Ps. 31.24: וּמִשְׁלָם; Origen: וּשְׁלָם.
 Ps. 31.25: חֲזָקוֹ; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 31.25: הַמִּי־חַלִּים; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 35.1: לֶחֶם; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 35.2: וְנִקְוָה; Origen: וְנִקְוִים.
 Ps. 35.14: בְּאֶבֶל; Origen: בְּאֶבֶל.
 Ps. 35.19: שְׂנְאִי; Origen: שְׂנְאִי.
 Ps. 35.19: אֵיבִי; Origen: אֵיבִי.
 Ps. 35.22: תִּתְחַרֵּשׁ; Origen: תִּתְחַרֵּשׁ.
 Ps. 35.25: בְּלִבָּם; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 35.27: חֶפְצִי; Origen: חֶפְצִי.
 Ps. 36.2: לִרְשָׁע; Origen: לִרְשָׁע; cf. paragraph XXV.
 Ps. 36.2: לִבִּי; cf. paragraph XVIII and XXI.
 Ps. 46.1: עֲלָמוֹת; Origen: עֲלָמוֹת.
 Ps. 46.2: עֲזָרָה; Origen: עֲזָר.
 Ps. 46.3: אֶרֶץ; cf. paragraph XXI.
 Ps. 46.5: וְשִׁמְחוּ; Origen: וְשִׁמְחוּ.
 Ps. 46.6: וַעֲזָרָה; Origen: וַעֲזָרָה.
 Ps. 46.9: שְׁמוֹת; Origen: שְׁמוֹת.
 Ps. 46.10: וְשִׁבְרָה; Origen: וְשִׁבְרָה.
 Ps. 48.3: צִמּוֹן; Origen: צִמּוֹן.
 Ps. 49.4: וְהִנֵּית; Origen: וְהִנֵּית.
 Ps. 49.4: חֲקִמּוֹת; Origen: חֲקִמּוֹת.
 Ps. 49.6: וְיִסְבְּנוּ; Origen: וְיִסְבְּנוּ.
 Ps. 49.6: עֲקָבִי; Origen: עֲקָבִי.
 Ps. 49.9: וְחִדְלָה; Origen: וְחִדְלָה.
 Ps. 49.12: קִרְאוּ; Origen: קִרְאוּ.
 Ps. 49.12: בְּתִימּוֹ; Origen: בְּתִימּוֹ.
 Ps. 49.14: וְרָצוּ; Origen: וְרָצוּ.
 Ps. 49.15: וַיִּתְחַדְּדוּ; Origen: וַיִּתְחַדְּדוּ.
 Ps. 75.4: עֲמוּדֶיהָ; Origen: עֲמוּדֶיהָ.

- Ps. 76.10: עָנִי; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 89.31: וּבְמִשְׁפָּטִי; Origen: וְהִלָּכִין.
 Ps. 89.31: וְהִלָּכִין; Origen: וְהִלָּכִין.
 Ps. 89.36: בְּקִדְשִׁי; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 89.45: מִנְרָתָהּ; Origen: מִנְרָתָהּ.
 Ps. 89.47: תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה; cf. paragraph XVIII.
 Ps. 89.51: וְזָכַר; Origen: וְזָכַר.
 Ps. 92.7: יָדַע; Origen: יָדַע.
 Ps. 110.3: מִשְׁחָר; Origen: מִשְׁחָר.
 Ps. 127.2: הֶעָצָבִים; Origen: הֶעָצָבִים.

When I had, then assistant editor for the Ancient Bible Versions of Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (third edition), to revise Frants Buhls manuscript on the book of Psalms for this edition, I embodied in it the variants from Origen's Hexapla, as far as they seemed to me to fit into the plans of the *Biblia Hebraica*; as a siglum I chose the sign "H^O," which means: the Hebrew of Origen. By an oversight, due to the death of Professor Rudolf Kittel and my subsequent resignation from the *Biblia Hebraica*, this sign is not contained in the explanatory list of that edition. The same is true of the siglum "T^P," which I had chosen for variants from the Palestinian Targum on the Pentateuch; cf. *MdW* I, p. 11*, note 1.

XXIII. THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE HEBREW ALPHABET

In the fall of 1927 I began to study the Greek transliterations of Hebrew proper names contained in the Septuagint, which served as the starting point for this investigation. I soon realized the necessity to extend my investigation also to the material from the Second Column of the Hexapla of Origen. In my paper "Das Alphabet der Septuaginta-Vorlage" (*OLZ* 1929, p. 533-40) I summed up the results which I had arrived at then in the following sentences: "Zwischen der Abfassungszeit der Septuaginta und der der Hexapla des Origenes liegen vier bis fünf Jahrhunderte; trotzdem glaube ich im Rechte zu sein, wenn ich die Transkriptionen der Septuaginta und die der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla *zusammen* behandelt wissen möchte. Denn weder ist—

wie schon Wutz richtig erkannt hat—die zweite Kolumne eine erst ad hoc angefertigte Transkription, noch können wir in den Transkriptionen der frühestens aus dem vierten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert stammenden ältesten Septuaginta-Handschrift die Aussprache des Hebräischen im 3.–2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert wiedererkennen. Hier wie dort ist das Material verschiedener Epochen in buntem Durcheinander und man kann ebensowenig eine Grammatik des Hebräischen im 2. nachchristlichen Jahrhundert auf Grund der Transkriptionen der 2. Kolumne schreiben, wie eine Grammatik des Hebräischen im 3.–2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert auf Grund der Transkriptionen der Septuaginta; denn es handelt sich dabei nicht um einheitliche Formen, die sich in *eine* Grammatik zusammenfassen lassen. Dagegen ist es unter Benutzung des gesamten Transkriptionsmaterials, das aus diesen zwei Quellen stammt, bis zu einem gewissen Grade wohl möglich, den *Wandel* in der Aussprache des Hebräischen vom 3. vorchristlichen bis zum 2. nachchristlichen Jahrhundert zu verfolgen." The subsequent years of study since the publication of the paper cited here, and the inclusion of Jerome's transliterations in this monograph, only confirmed me in my conviction of the correctness of that statement. Consequently, only inner criteria were used in the arrangement of the material, and the relatively higher or lower age of the respective sources has been entirely disregarded; cf. ¶ XXXII and ¶ XXXIII.

Originally I had in mind to write only an essay on the pronunciation of the Hebrew consonants in the period of the Septuagint. By means of the alphabetical arrangement of source material in the third part of this study, this problem is for the most part solved of its own accord and I can limit myself to brief explanatory notes:

א has no consonantal value of its own, but serves only to carry a vowel sign; cf. paragraph XI.

ב is always β.

ג is γ; the gemination of ג is transliterated by γγ, f. i. חגי אγγει; at the end of the word ג is sometimes rendered by κ, as f. i. in דאג δωηκ, פלג φαλεκ; (cf. Mayser, §36 I, 1).

ד is δ; at the end of the word it is not infrequently θ, f. i. זבד.

ζαβουθ, כבוד, χαβωθ, עובד, obeth; see also: מועץ העיר αεγυθ and פחד faath; cf. Mayser, §36 III, 1).

ה is without consonantal value, like א; at the beginning of the word. Jerome nevertheless often transliterates it by h; cf., f. i., הוד hod, המה homa, as compared with הבל abal, הרים arim; cf. also in his Onomastica: הוא hu. Since the Onomastica go back to a *Vorlage* in Greek characters (see paragraph VII), which have no equivalent for an h in their alphabet and considered the ה merely as the bearer of the respective vowel (see Jerome's general statement in paragraph XI), we are lead to the conclusion that Jerome added here the h upon his own responsibility, probably after having consulted the Hebrew text. It is worth while noting that this is—as far as I can see—the only case of transliterating an ה by an h in the Onomastica (cases like Ahihod for אחיהוד in Num. 34.27 are explained in paragraph X) and it does not concern a real proper name, but the Hebrew phrase מן הווא in Ex. 16.15.

ו at the beginning of the word is mostly ου; cf. the cases of waw conjunctivum and waw consecutivum, as dealt with in §§78 and 79; otherwise it is ου or ω; cf. Jerome's statement (editio Vallarsi, vol. VI, p. 366C): "vau quippe litera et pro u, et pro o, eorum lingua accipitur." The same uncertainty as to whether to vocalize a given word with u or with o can be noted in BV also, cf., f. i., in Ms. Ec 1 בטוב Ps. 27.13 and בטוב ib. 65.5; מותר Prov. 14.23 and ומותר ib. 21.5; בעץ Ps. 21.2 and עץ ib. 63.3; עמקה Prov. 22.14 and עמקה ib. 23.27; תבואה Prov. 10.16 and תבואה ib. 18.20. To illustrate Jerome's assertion, cf. f. i., sub סוד: βασιδ and σουδεις; sub צור: σουρ and σωρ; sub המון: αμουν and amun; sub כמר: χαμαρειμ and acchumarim; sub עור: αγορ and agur. This statement of Jerome may also be applied to those transliterations, where ου and ω are promiscuously used to indicate the vowel, which is represented in Hebrew by another mater lectionis; f. i. ראש: ρως and rus. B-L §14q has to be corrected accordingly: it is not so, that the o in קנות changed into u in קנוחה; but קנוחה is a further development of the feminine formation to מנוח as manue (with u), cf. the Dictionary s. v. Originally this form must have been pronounced מנוחה manua, with retention of the first vowel a; cf. paragraph XXVIa; cf. similarly (אבל)

מחול rendered as *μαουλα* in 1 Kings 4.12 and *μεουλα* in Jud. 7.22 (both in Cod. B); for the change of *α* into *ε* cf. paragraph XXVIIb.

י in the earlier period corresponds to *σ*, f. i.: *אחז* *αχας*, *יורע* *ισρα*, *יורח* *ιερραε*, *גורזי* *νεγρεσθι*, *כוב* *chasab*, *מזבח* *μασβηη*; later it was transliterated by *ζ*; cf. in the Dictionary the list of words beginning with י; cf. Mayser, §46 I.

ח in the earlier period equals *χ*; cf. the characteristics of codex B and A in paragraph IV and our discussion of Jerome's remark on *חם* in paragraph VIII. In the later period *ח* lost its consonantal value and like *א* served merely for carrying the vowel. We may assume that the transition from the earlier to the later period is marked by those transliterations, where *ח* is rendered by *ε*; note f. i. at the beginning of the word: *חזו* *εεζου*, *חזק* *εεζεκ*, *החליק* *εελικ*; in the middle of the word: *כחשו* *chaesu*, *לחם* *λαεμ*, *מחלה* *μαελα*; at the end of the word: *זרח* *ζαραε*, *יורח* *ιερραε*, *יפחח* *ιεφθαε*, *זנוח* *zanoi*, *מנוח* *μανωε*, *מזבח* *μασβηη*. These transliterations can, therefore, not be used as evidence for the existence of a *pataḥ furtivum*, as B-L. §18j would make us believe. The only cases of *pataḥ furtivum* in transliterations are *עולה* *colea*, *רוח* *rua*. In this connection I wish to point out, that B-L. §14f is likewise incorrect: *ח* was never transliterated as *κ*; but according to Greek phonetics, *χ* at the end of a word could phonetically and, consequently graphically, be confused with *κ*. cf. to כ. The transliteration of *טבח* as *ταβεκ*, which B-L. quote as a proof for their assertion, is therefore to be explained as a further inner Greek development of the form *tabech* (= *ταβεχ*, cf. paragraph X), as represented by Jerome in his *Onomastica*; cf. the Dictionary s. v.

ט is *τ*.

י is *ι* and its phonetic derivations: *ε*, *η*, *αι*, *ει*; note f. i. in §55a: *תסתר* *θεσθερ*, with *ε*, but *תסתרם* *θεσθιρημ* with *ι*; also the transliteration of the suffix in *חיתני* *ιθανι* as compared with *דליתני* *δελλιθανη* (§73b), and the examples listed in §123 1) 2) 4). Note further *בית* *βαιθ* (§138a) as compared with *βηθ* (§138b) and s. v. *בן*: *βαναι* as compared with *βανη*; cf. also the helping vowels (*ε*, *ι*, *η*) in §127.

כ is *χ*; as exceptions, which are most likely due to the phonetic

interchange of χ and κ , I note: כבוד caboth; ככר κεχαρ B; כל kol A; כלין κελαιων B; כפיר caphir; כפתורים caphthorim; the gemination is indicated in the Septuagint by $\kappa\chi$, in Origen by $\chi\chi$; cf. f. i.: sub סכה σοκχωθ (G) and σοχχα (O). At the end of the word it is sometimes rendered by κ ; f. i.: סכך σαβεκ, סמך σαμακ, מלך μελεκ.

ל is λ.

מ is μ.

נ is ν.

ס is σ.

ע is not a consonant, but a vowel; cf. on א, and Jerome's assertions in paragraph VIII. In the middle and at the end of the word it was sometimes transliterated by ε (cf. on ח); f. i. in the middle of the word: נעם νεεμ, רעם reem; see also Jerome's statement on בעלי in paragraph IX; at the end of the word: שמע σαμαε, ידע ιαδαε, יפיע ιαφιε, רע רקηε, שוע sue; cf. similar forms in BV: Job 15.8: חשבע, ib. 13.19: ואנוע; see MTK, p. 31. Against the assumption in B-L. §18j, cf. on ח.—In the Septuagint and accordingly in Jerome's Onomastica cases are still recorded, where an ע, corresponding to an Arabic ع, is transliterated by γ; cf. f. i. Jerome's statements on עמרה and on צער in paragraph VIII.

פ is rendered in almost all the instances by φ. Jerome even makes a general statement to the effect that no equivalent for the Latin character P can be found in the Hebrew alphabet (editio Vallarsi, vol. V, p. 724 C): "אפדנו APEDNO. Notandum autem, quod P literam Hebraeus sermo non habeat, sed pro ipsa utatur PHE, cuius vim Graecum φ sonat. In isto tantum loco apud Hebraeos scribatur quidem PHE, sed legatur P." As exceptions I would like to note: פחד πααδ and פתח παθα; the spelling iephte for יפתח and neptalti for נפתלתי may originate in printers (or even copists) mistakes, instead of iephthe and nephthalthi. The gemination of פ is indicated in the Septuagint by πφ and in Origen by φφ; cf. f. i.: s. v. תפוח: θαπφουε (A) and thaffue, s. v. צפור: σεπφωρ (G), s. v. באף: βααφφω (O), s. v. נפל: ιεφφολου (O). Forms like חפה χοφφα (B) would prove the late date, when this transliteration originated; but on the other hand, the rendering of ח by χ is old, cf. on ח.

ז is σ; cf. Jerome's statements in paragraph XIII.

ק is κ.

ר is ρ.

ש and ש are σ; cf. Jerome's assertions in paragraph XIII and our conclusions in paragraph XIV.

ח is θ; gemination: טθ (in the Septuagint) and θθ (in Origen); cf. f. i.: מֶחֱ מַטְּאֵן (G), אֶחָה אֶמְּאָה (O), s. v. מֶחֱ: οὐλεθθεν (O).

This list together with the list given in paragraph X will be sufficient to clarify the problem of the phonetic value of the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets respectively, too. Only one letter remains, which requires a special discussion: ε (e). Does this letter indicate a full vowel or only a murmuring vowel? We are anxious not to introduce into this monograph the terminology of the Tiberian grammar; otherwise we would formulate our problem thus: does ε stand for a vowel or for a שׁוֹא? The cases dealt with in §19b as differentiated from c might suggest an answer that ε could very well be thought of as indicating a mere murmuring vowel. But these three instances are, as far as I can see, the only possible proofs for such an assumption, since elsewhere ε stands for a short i sound; cf. f. i. §23α and β. On the other hand it seems to me that the murmuring vowel or שׁוֹא of the Tiberian grammar has no equivalent in the pronunciation underlying the transliterations; cf. §22: זכר שׁמֶע שׁמֶע שׁמֶע; §23: לכוֹ לכוֹ. It is practically impossible to pronounce these words, without inserting some kind of a helping vowel between the two subsequent consonants. And yet the transliterator saw no need to indicate it. Consequently, if we find an ε, we have to consider it as representing a full vowel. But how then can we account for the cases listed in §19b? The form נחֻשָּׁה נֶסֶסֶסֶסֶס can be eliminated, since ε may be considered as the consonantal equivalent of ח (cf. above sub ח) and not as a vowel; thus this form belongs to the subdivision c, being like נחֻשָּׁה drusa. Otherwise §19b corresponds exactly to the nominative forms listed in §103 (as compared with §102). The close phonetic relationship between ε and ι may also be realized from the transliterations in §55α, where ε and ι are used promiscuously; cf. especially the change of ε into ι from the absolute form חֶסֶד חֶסֶדֶסֶד to the corresponding conjugated form חֶסֶדֶסֶדֶסֶדֶסֶד, while חֶסֶדֶסֶדֶסֶדֶסֶד has the ι even in the absolute form.

XXIV. SIGLA

As for the scheme and the arrangement of this study, I trust that I have been sufficiently successful in the systematic ordering and classifying of the transliterations, so that a few short notes of explanation will suffice to make the use of it a relatively simple matter.

The following abbreviations have been employed: A stands for Codex A of the Septuagint; B for Codex B; where both codices agree in their reading, I put G.—O indicates the Second Column of Origen's Hexapla.—H—R refers to the Septuagint Concordance by Hatch and Redpath; cf. ¶ V.—Quotations in Latin alphabet originate from Jerome: On after such a citation indicates, that it is taken from his *Onomastica Sacra*; J gives his commentaries as the source.—MT = the Hebrew Masoretic Text, according to Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, Leipzig 1905.—MdO = P. Kahle: *Masoreten des Ostens*, Leipzig 1913.—The sigla used in connection with Hebrew words in Babylonian vocalization (f. i. Ec 1) refer to Professor Kahle's "Catalogue of Hebrew Bible Mss. from Babylon," published in the *ZAW* 1928, pp. 113–137. A continuation of this Catalogue appeared in a leaflet headed: "Sigla für die hebräischen Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien," which is included in the edition of *Numeri et Deuteronomium* of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, Stuttgart 1935.—MTK = Paul Kahle, *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, Leipzig 1902. The basis of this monograph is the Ms. or. qu. 680 of the Berlin State Library, which is called "Ec 1" in the above cited Catalogue.—MdWI = Paul Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* I. Stuttgart 1927.—MdWII = id., II. Stuttgart 1930.—Bar = Falk Bar, *Liturgische Dichtungen von Jannai und Samuel*, Bonn 1936.—Edelmann = Raphael Edelmann, *Zur Frühgeschichte des Mahzor*, Stuttgart 1934.—Ms. 105 JThS = A Bible Ms. with the Babylonian vocalization containing most of the former prophets with Targum, in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.—B-L = Hans Bauer und Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Halle (Saale) 1918seq. —ZAW = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.—BV = Babylonian vocalization.—PV = Palestinian vocalization.—Sam. = Hebrew Pentateuch of the

Samaritans (not to be identified with von Gall's edition! Cf. paragraph XXVI f.).—Mayser = E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit*, Leipzig 1906.—Thompson = E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford 1912.

XXV. METHOD APPLIED

I put myself to pains to explain every form in transliteration from the standpoint of the text as it is found, without attempting to make arbitrary corrections in conformity with the Masoretic text. The temptation to such a procedure was frequently very great, particularly in those passages, where the different reading of Origen's Hexapla, as compared with the corresponding Hebrew word, did not seem to fit in the context; cf. f. i. Mal. 2.13: MT: פָּנוּחַ (Ḳal), Origen: פְּנוּחַ (Pi'el). According to the usage of biblical Hebrew, the verb פָּנַח in the Ḳal means "to turn somewhere," and in the Pi'el "to remove something." It is obvious that Origen, although he read here the verb in the Pi'el, must have connected with it the meaning of the Ḳal; for otherwise the sentence is senseless. A similar case is Ps. 36.2: MT: לְרָשָׁע, Origen: לְרָשָׁע. The Masoretic vocalization indicates a person who sins, whilst the transliteration would mean the abstractum, the sin. But the personal suffix in the following word לְבִי clearly refers to a person. Whether Origen has been misled by the rhythm: *φρσα . . . ρεσα*, or whether in his days רָשָׁע and רָשָׁע could be used promiscuously to indicate the same meaning, is hard to decide; cf. also Isa. 26.10, where Jerome reads רָשָׁע for the Masoretic רָשָׁע.

I was saved from any such treatment of the transliterations as based upon subjective corrections by the methodology indicated by Bergsträsser as fundamental to all scholarly activity of this type (*Hebräische Grammatik*, II. Teil. I. C. Hinrichs. Leipzig 1929, p. v): "Zu beachten ist, dass ein in seinem Aufbau gestörter, im ganzen sinnloser Satz sehr wohl einwandfreie Einzelworte und -formen enthalten, dass umgekehrt aus zum Teil unmöglichen Einzelformen ein syntaktisch möglicher Satz aufgebaut sein, ja dass innerhalb des Einzelwortes Sinnvolles und Sinnloses sich mischen kann, dass also die Frage der grammatischen Verwertbarkeit von Fall zu Fall mit Rücksicht auf

die zur Erörterung stehende grammatische Erscheinung erwogen werden muss." As an example of the possibilities last referred to by Bergsträsser I should like to cite the word $\eta\eta\eta\eta$ in Ps. 31.8 which according to Wutz is rendered by Origen: $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\zeta\delta\alpha\chi$, and according to H-R: $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\delta\alpha\chi$. Both transliterations are open to suspicion. Even the rendering of a σ by ζ (according to Wutz) would constitute a $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\chi$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$; but its transliteration into λ (according to H-R) is completely inexplicable. Yet in §118a I have included the word, since there the prepositions are discussed and in that connection the rendering of η in $\eta\eta\eta\eta$ is a matter not open to doubt.

XXVI. GENERAL RESULTS: THE NOUN

a) I am inclined to consider as the most characteristic feature of the pronunciation of Hebrew, as reflected in the transliterations, the fact that the vocalization of the noun does not undergo any changes—except in the latter period—when suffixa are added to it (as for instance: the personal pronoun, the feminine ending), or when the noun is being put in the plural. To illustrate this fact, I bring a selection of examples in the same order as they are listed in the Grammar, always referring to the paragraph, where they can be found: §15a; the singular-forms, which have to be presupposed, can be seen in §13. It will be noted that the second vowel in the singular-forms is an η (f. i. $\eta\eta\eta$), whilst in the plural-forms the spelling is with an ϵ (f. i. $\eta\eta\eta\epsilon$). Whether this is only accidental, since ϵ and η were at the time of the transliterations no longer differentiated (cf. f. i. $\eta\eta\epsilon$ and $\eta\eta\epsilon\eta$), or whether this change in spelling was meant to indicate that the accent does not rest any longer on this syllable, I must leave open.—§19a; in §20a note $\eta\eta\eta$ latusim.—§82b: $\eta\eta\eta$ and $\eta\eta\eta$.—§91a: $\eta\eta\eta$; $\eta\eta\eta$; $\eta\eta\eta$; $\eta\eta\eta$.—§94a: $\eta\eta\eta$ and $\eta\eta\eta$, as compared with the corresponding forms in §94: $\eta\eta\eta$ and $\eta\eta\eta$.—§123: $\eta\eta\eta$; $\eta\eta\eta$.—§126: $\eta\eta\eta$.—§131: $\eta\eta\eta$.—§133: $\eta\eta\eta$.—§136a: $\eta\eta\eta$, $\eta\eta\eta$; $\eta\eta\eta$.

σαριδ, saridim; חמר *θαμαρ*, thamarim.—§137b: גבעה *γαβαα*, *γαβαωθ*; גדרה *γαδηρα*, *γαδηρωθ*; גלילה *γαλιλα*, *γαλιλωθ*. This grammatical rule can be traced even in the Babylonian and Palestinian systems; cf. לְבָרָדִים Lam. 3.23; Ps. 101.8; Job 7.18 in Ms. Ec 1 (MTK, p. 71) בְּרָאשֵׁי 1 Ki. 20.32 in Ms. 105 JThS; cf. also paragraph XXIXB subdivision 6.—In this connection I wish to point out that originally even the Construct State did not imply a change or a dropping of a vowel; cf. f. i. §138a and §139; also in §140b forms like: אמרה *εμαραθ*; אשמה *asamath*; גבעה *γαβααθ*; in §141: ארמון *armanoth* and שדמה *σαδημωθ*; cf. ¶ XXIX B 8.

Consequently, if we find the following forms in transliteration for the Hebrew root מלך: מלך *μελεχ*; מלך *ammelech*; מלכי *μελχει*, *malchi*; מלככם *melchechem*; מלכם *μελχαμ*; למלכי *λαμαλχη*—they go back to the following different ways of pronouncing this triconsonantal noun, and have to be arranged accordingly: מלך: a) (cf. §84): מלכי *malchi*, למלכי *λαμαλχη*; b) (cf. §85): מלכי *μελχει*, מלככם *melchechem*, מלכם *μελχαμ*; c) (cf. §95): מלך *μελεχ*, מלך *ammelech*. Similarly, שרפים *seraphim* must not be regarded as a pluralis fractus to שרף *saraph*—to which the plural could only be *saraphim*, cf. חמר *θαμαρ*, plur. *thamarim*—, but is the regularly built plural to שרף *seraph*.

b) Generally speaking, all nouns can be divided into three main groups according to their characteristic vowel: the a-class, the i-class and the o-class. Further phonetic development results in the partition of the i-class into an *ε*-group and an *ι*-group (cf. paragraph XXIII sub י), and similarly in a subdivision of the o-class into an *ο*-group and an *ου*-group (cf. ib. sub ו). This observation furnished us with the key for the systematical arrangement of the various nominal formations. While applying this system to the Bisyllabic Triconsonantal Nouns (chapter XIII) we noticed, much to our own surprise, that it was the *second* syllable that mostly had the characteristic vowel, the first syllable varying in every group between *α* and *ε*. This would suggest a supposition that in these cases the second syllable had the stressed vowel, a rather startling assertion; for these nouns generally coincide with nominal formations called in the Tiberian grammar *nomina segolata*, whose characteristic feature it is that

their second vowel is grammatically considered as a mere helping vowel, the first vowel being the stressed one. We confine ourselves here to merely noting this amazing fact without commenting upon it; cf. the explanation of this attitude of ours in paragraph XXVIII. The variation between *a* and *ε* as first vowel we would attribute to dialectical differences; cf. paragraph XXXIII. The same variation occurs also in §19a compared with *b*, and in §117 compared with §118; cf. subdivision *e* near the end.

c) Nearly all the cases of nominal formations with prefixed מ, which can be found in transliteration, have the vowel *a* in the first syllable; they are listed and classified in chapter XIV. But still the following few forms remain to be mentioned, where the prefix has the vowel *i*: s. v. מִזְרָה: *mimizra*; s. v. מִצְהֵלָה: *mesaloth*; s. v. מִשְׁפָּט: *mesphat*, *μεσφατι* O; s. v. מִשְׁכָּן: *meschen* O; s. v. מִשְׁפָּט: *mesphat*, *μεσφατι* O; s. v. מִשְׁרָה: *mesra*.

In this connection I wish to call the attention to a similar fact: According to §139, the formation of the stat. constr. masc. plur. does not involve any change of a vowel in the transliteration. The only exception I am aware of is: s. v. בֵּן *βνη* O (as compared with *βανη* in codex A).

d) Chapter XV proves that the article has always been pronounced as “*a*”, even—if we be permitted to point to a differentiation in the Tiberian Grammar—before a ה, (cf. B-L. §31k); cf. in §114: *החפץ* *ααφης* and *החנב* *aagab*.—It seems that only from the period of the Second Column on, which coincides, as we said in paragraph V, with Codex A of the Septuagint, the article was followed by gemination of the immediately subsequent consonant; cf. f. i. הקוץ *ακως*, הלוחש *αλωης*, and הקטן *ακαταν*, all three in codex B (§115), as compared with their spelling *ακκως*, *αλλωης*, and *ακκαταν* in codex A (§116). The period of the Second Column marks the beginning, and not the final accomplishment of this development. So it is explicable that in even as late a period as Jerome’s days this rule was not yet strictly observed; note f. i. forms like: הדגים *adagim*, הצדק *asedec* (§115), taken from his Commentaries.

e) A careful examination of the examples listed and arranged in Chapter XVI will prove that the transliteration of the Inseparable Prepositions בכל as *βα*, *χα*, *λα* respectively (in §117),

does not coincide with the cases, when according to the Tiberian grammar (cf. B-L. §25w), they carry this vowel to indicate the article; note f. i. cases like בִּיה *baia*, בְּכַעס *baχas*, בְּלִבָּם *βαλβαβαμ*; the context (construct state or noun with personal suffixes) excludes any possibility of vocalizing these words as with an article; cf. paragraph XXIXB 5.

f) 1) The pronunciation of the nominal suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc. as *αχ*, as expounded in §124 subdivision 1, is upheld by the spelling יְחִידָךְ in Sam. Gen. 22.2, 13, 16 for יְחִידֶךָ of the Masoretic Text. The *α* is in these cases *mater lectionis* for "a"; cf. in Sam. forms like Gen. 42.38; 44.32: בִּיאָנוּן (MT: בָּיָנוּן); Ex. 23.31: וְשֹׁאֲחִי (MT: וְשָׁחִי); Num. 5.18: הַמֵּאֲרִים (MT: הַמֵּרִים); Deut. 28.7: הַקְּאֻמִּים (MT: הַתְּקֻמִּים); cf. also paragraph XXIXB1.—2) According to §128, between the noun in the singular and the suffix of the 2. pers. plur. masc. *χεμ*, a helping vowel *ε* is inserted; cf. corresponding forms in the Sam. Lev. 26.19: עֹיִכֶם (MT: עֲיֹכֶם); Ex. 12.11: וּמִקְלִיכֶם (MT: וּמִקְלָכֶם); Lev. 1.2: קִרְבְּנִיכֶם (MT: קִרְבְּנֹכֶם). In these instances the noun is undoubtedly in the sing.; for the plural formations of the cited nouns would be וּמִקְלוֹתֵיכֶם and קִרְבוֹתֵיכֶם respectively; cf. also Sam. Gen. 45.20: וְעֵינֵיכֶם (MT: וְעֵינֶיכֶם), which is a sing. form, according to the verb תַּחֲוֹס; cf. also paragraph XXIXB16.—3) The vocalization of the suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc. with verbal forms as *ach* (cf. §74β) has its parallel in the spelling with Sam. Num. 11.23: הִיקָרְךָ (MT: הִיקֶרְךָ).

It is very regrettable that we could not rely on the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which Gall used as the basis for his edition (*Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, Giessen 1914–18), but had to consult his apparatus criticus in nearly all the instances, where reference is made throughout this monograph to Sam.

XXVII. THE VERB

1) Verbal forms (and nominal forms just the same) I have arranged according to the criterion of similar vocalization in the spelling of the transliteration, without paying too much attention as to whether this treatment is justified by their place in the Hebrew conjugations. Take for instance §54: The common element in

the forms discussed there is their vocalization *a-ı*. For this reason I have listed the forms of Imperfect *Ḳal* of the *verba mediae* ' together with the Imperfect *Hiph'il* forms of the *verba mediae* ı, since they belong to that category by virtue of their vocalization (*a-ı*).

2) The verb is dealt with in the Grammar exhaustively; at least I endeavoured, and I may hope that I succeeded in listing there every form which occurs in transliteration. I originally tried to reach the same degree of completeness even in the second part of the Grammar, dealing with the nominal forms: but experience taught me the impossibility of attaining that goal, and practical considerations proved that it may not even be desirable to overload the lists, which are sometimes long enough anyhow.

3) Chapter IX shows that in the earlier period the waw, both as waw conjunctivum and as waw consecutivum, was similarly transliterated merely as *w*; cf. paragraph XXXIII subdivision 3; cf. also in the MT forms like: וְאָכַרְתָּ and וְאָבֹא (Isa. 37.24). There can be no doubt at all, that the waws in these verbal forms are consecutive waws; note the perfect פָּלִיתִי in verse 24, marking the beginning of this poem. B.-L. §24d is therefore wrong in stating that “die ursprüngliche Form dieser Konjunktion (scil. the waw consecutivum) ist *ya* (mit kurzem freiem *a*)”; similarly, the *Biblia Hebraica* editio R. Kittel (Liber Jesaiae, Stuttgart 1929) had no right to emend these forms into: וְאָכַרְתָּ, וְאָבֹא, וְאַחֲרָיו and וְהָיָה. Here again, as in the case of the article (cf. paragraphs XXVI d and XXVIII subdivision 4), the Second Column marks the beginning of a new method; cf. §79. But forms like מֵעַמְדֶם עַמְדֶם וְתַתן (§78a), וְיִקְרָא וְיִקְרָא וְיִקְרָא (§78b), וְיִקְרָא וְיִקְרָא וְיִקְרָא (§78c) prove that here, too, this development had just begun and the goal was still far from being reached.

XXVIII. RELATION TO THE TIBERIAN SYSTEM

I purposely avoided referring to the rules of Hebrew Grammar according to the Tiberian School. The problem as to whether the Tiberian system can be linked to the non-Masoretic systems (I emphasize the plural!), has to be investigated very carefully,

and I would consider it poor method, if I were to pick out the raisins from the cake, instead of paying similar attention to all the grammatical and lexical phenomena. Nevertheless, here and there I pointed out a few striking proofs of divergencies in the development of the two systems in question (i. e. the Tiberian system and the transliterations),—cf. f. i. our remarks on וְתִאֲרֶנִּי (s. v. אֲרָא), אֶכְיֹב (s. v. כֹּזֵב), אִינוֹן (s. v. דְּבָרִיד, דְּבַר), as well as §5a, §15—by merely citing the corresponding paragraph in B-L.

By this procedure I merely wish to indicate what a new approach to so many problems of Hebrew grammar we may arrive at by freeing ourselves of the traditional grammatical conception. Instead of fixing rules and noting exceptions to these rules, a practice adopted by all Hebrew grammars, we do better to realize that the cases listed as mere exceptions form also rules, and are evidence of an otherwise forgotten different pronunciation of certain grammatical formations. To this conclusion we are lead by projecting the results of this monograph upon the Tiberian vocalization. I would rather have any more detailed discussion of these problems postponed until my researches in this field are advanced enough to permit the formulation of more or less definite conclusions. Only this I wish to make clear right now that instead of speaking of the Tiberian system (in the singular!) I would consider it more appropriate to differentiate between the *various ways of pronouncing Hebrew, by the combination of which the so-called Tiberian system arose*. To substantiate this statement, which if proven to be correct, will result, I am sure, in an essentially new explanation of very many grammatical phenomena, thus leading towards the establishment of dialectical differences in the pronunciation of Hebrew between the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, cf. paragraph XXXIII, I wish to bring a few instances of rather general importance: 1) In the Tiberian grammar the gutturals are treated sometimes as full and sometimes as weak consonants; cf. s. v. אָסַר the forms: וְאָסַר Gen. 46.29 and וְאָסַר ib. 42.24; לָאָסַר Ps. 105.22 and לָאָסַר Num. 30.3.—s. v. חָבַל the forms: תְּחַבֵּל Ex. 22.25 and תְּחַבֵּל Deut. 24.6.—s. v. חָפַךְ the forms: נִהְפְּכוּ Ps. 78.57 and נִהְפְּכוּ 1 Sam. 4.19.—s. v. חָזַק the forms: יִחְזְקוּ Isa. 28.22 and יִחְזְקוּ 2 Sam. 10.11.—s. v. חָרַד the forms: יִחְרְדוּ Ezek. 26.18 and יִחְרְדוּ

Hos. 11.11. — 2) The current Hebrew grammar invented the term "virtual lengthening," to explain away some of the cases, where a guttural is treated as a full consonant; cf. s. v. בער the forms: לָבַעַר Neh. 10.35 and לָבַעַר Isa. 44.15. — 3) We leave the question open as to whether nominal and verbal forms in pausa represent a lengthening of the context forms or the original forms; but there can be no doubt about it that both, the context form and its pausal form, belong to the same respective grammatical scheme (qatl, qítl, qutl or with a, i, u in the perfect respectively, to give an instance); how can we now account for instance for the following pausal forms: s. v. בָּטַן Num. 5.21: בָּטַן a qítl-form, but in pausa: Gen. 30.2: בָּטַן a qatl-form; s. v. שָׁבַט Prov. 13.24: שָׁבַט a qítl-form, but in pausa: Ex. 28.21: שָׁבַט a qatl-form; s. v. שָׁמַשׁ Jer. 15.9: שָׁמַשׁ a qítl-form, but in pausa: Eccl. 1.3: הַשָּׁמֶשׁ a qatl-form. Or verbal forms: Gen. 37.3: אָהַב and ib. 27.14: אָהַב; Gen. 2.24: דָּבַק and 2 Kings 3.3: דָּבַק. The usual explanation that these pausal forms are built on the analogy of the other respective group of nominal or verbal forms, does not suffice at all; for, strangely enough, the three nouns cited here are vocalized with an *a* (i. e., as qatl-forms, to use the Tiberian terminology) in the Babylonian vocalization, and in the transliterations, and even their equivalent in Arabic is vocalized with an *a*. Consequently, instead of considering the Tiberian pausal forms as exceptions which require explanation, we find that the respective context-forms fall out of the regular qatl-scheme and belong to a different tradition, which served as one of the basic sources for the Tiberian vocalization. — 4) A similar development we can notice with certain forms with waw consecutivum, like: s. v. בָּנָה the forms: Gen. 2.22: וַיִּבְנוּ and Josh. 19.50: וַיִּבְנוּ; s. v. נָכַח the forms: Jer. 52.27: וַיִּנָּח and 2 Kings 25.21: וַיִּנָּח; s. v. אָוָה the forms: 2 Sam. 23.15: וַיִּתְאַוּ and 1 Chron. 14.17: וַיִּתְאַוּ; further s. v. אָסַף the forms: Num. 11.30: וַיִּאָּסֶף and Gen. 49.33: וַיִּאָּסֶף; s. v. בָּעַר the forms: Jud. 15.5: וַיִּבָּעַר and וַיִּבָּעַר; s. v. יָשַׁב the forms: Gen. 47.11: וַיֵּשֶׁב and Ps. 107.36: וַיֵּשֶׁב. — 5) To explain away the inconsistency in applying the dagesh lene to the בּוֹרַכְתָּ, the grammarians invented the term "שׁוֹאָ medium," the apparent fallacy of which may be demonstrated by a few instances: s. v. בָּרַכָה the forms: Gen. 49.26: בָּרַכְתָּ and ib. 28.4:

בְּרִכָּה; further Jer. 17.2: בָּכֹר and 2 Sam. 17.9: כִּנְפֹל; s. v. הִפֵּךְ the forms: Gen. 19.21: הִפְכִּי and 2 Sam. 10.3: וְלִהְפֹּךְ. These and many other similar observations induced me to refrain as far as possible from referring to any parallel phenomena as might otherwise have been pointed out in the course of this study.

XXIX. RELATION TO THE BABYLONIAN AND PALESTINIAN SYSTEM

Entirely different is my attitude in this monograph towards the non-Masoretic systems of vocalization, namely the Babylonian and the Palestinian system. I went carefully through all the material I could get hold of (cf. the list of abbreviations in paragraph XXIV) and made as profuse a use of it as possible. The references to words with the Babylonian vocalization in most cases go back to manuscripts and Geniza fragments, which have not been published until now anywhere else; these texts have been made available to me by the curtesy of Professor Kahle and Professor Marx (cf. paragraph XXXIV). But although the references with the Palestinian vocalization appeared already in print in various text publications, I still venture to say that *my evaluation* of these cited forms is *entirely new*, since I abandon the prevalent standpoint, as adopted in the text publications from which I derived my references, namely not to consider these forms as units in themselves, but always to discuss merely their single vowel points in connection with and as equivalents of the corresponding Tiberian punctuation; cf. f. i. MdW¹ II, p. 17*: "Dies Zeichen (i. e. ^) steht auch da, wo in tiberischer Punktation ein defektiv geschriebenes kurzes u steht Von den beiden Zeichen für e (' und ') entspricht im allgemeinen das erstere tiberischem Şere, das letztere tiberischen Segol und Šwa mobile; jedoch findet sich das erstere Zeichen häufig auch da, wo wir Šwa mobile erwarten würden . . . ; das Zeichen entspricht auch öfters tiberischem Segol Andererseits entspricht das Zeichen ^ gelegentlich auch tiberischem Şere," etc. Bar p. 19: "Ein Schwa kennt die Handschrift nicht. Stets ist ein bei uns mit שׁוּא versehener Buchstabe mit Vokal versehen. Am häufigsten mit einem a Vokal."

By these explanations the learned editors of the texts referred to presuppose—though perhaps without being aware of it themselves—that the Palestinian vocalization represents merely a new possibility of expressing Tiberian Hebrew vowels. To disprove any assumption of this kind, we wish to point out two examples: In the forms בְּמִלְכָּהִים (for בְּמִלְכָּהִים, cf. further down sub B 11), and יִצְעִי (cf. ib. 8) we would have to explain the first ' as corresponding to a שווא, and the immediately following same vowel sign as a Şere or Segol respectively. The aim of the vocalization was surely not to confuse the reader, who would thus be at a perfect loss in his endeavors to identify the ' with one of the corresponding Tiberian vowels. Similarly we would consider it utterly illogical to state that "in the PV the שווא is replaced by a vowel, mostly by a." We are entitled to expect an explanation as to when this שווא is replaced by an a and when and under what phonetic conditions by another vowel; furthermore: how do we know that a שווא was originally there; and why was a full vowel substituted for it? Cf. our refutation of O. Pretzl in paragraph III.—Pontus Leander's "Bemerkungen zur palastinischen Überlieferung des Hebräischen" (ZAW 1936, pp. 91–99) deal with the subject from an entirely different angle.

In dealing with these non-Masoretic texts, I on the other hand paid no attention whatsoever to the Tiberian system, but was anxious to *explain* every *grammatical phenomenon* apart from any outside consideration, startling though the results may have seemed at first to a man who has been thoroughly trained in the Masoretic Grammar. I thus hope to have paved the way also for a real grammatical appreciation of Hebrew according to these two non-Masoretic vocalization systems.

A. 1) As a parallel phenomenon to the cases of preservation of the second vowel in verbal forms, as dealt with in §5a and elsewhere (f. i. in §10ba the forms: יחַרְגוּ יפְלוּ יפְפֹּלוּ, יִשְׁמְרוּ יִשְׁמֹּרוּ), I should like to mention the Babylonian vocalization, where we meet similar forms, like: Job 6.17: יִחַרְגֻּבּוּ; ib. 6.25: נִמְרָצוּ; Ps. 106.28: יִצְעֲדוּ; all these instances are taken from the Ms. Ec 1; cf. also sub B 7.—2) The formations discussed in the §§7a, 31a and 49a have parallels in the Babylonian system, too, in forms like: יִבְרָכֶךָ, יִחַלֶּךָ and others, cf. MdO, p. 165. — 3) The

preservation of the second vowel in verbal forms with personal suffixes, as f. i. חֲזַרְנִי *thexorēni*, חֲסוּבִנִי *thswabβēni*, יוֹסִיבִנִי *swabβennou* (cf. §73 sq.), can be proved in the Babylonian system as well, cf. forms like: Prov. 29.4: יִהְיֶה֩ סֵנֶה׃; ib. 1.32: תִּהְרֹם׃; Job 29. 16: אֲחַקְדֹּהוּ׃; Ps. 37.33: יַעֲזֹבֵנו׃; ib. 27.9: תַּעֲזֹבֵנִי׃; Job 21.15: נִעְזְבִּנוּ׃; all these examples originate in the Ms. Ec 1; cf. also MdO, p. 185, and similarly here sub B 10. — 4) To the transliteration of the imperative of the pi'el with *ε* in the first syllable (§38a) cf. כִּבְרוּהוּ Ps. 22.24 in Ms. Ec 1 (MTK, p. 79); וְעֲנוּ Jud. 19.24 in Ms. 105 JThS. — 5) To the transliteration of the imperative of the hiph'il with *ε* in the first syllable (§63a) cf. הִטִּירוּ 1 Sam. 7.3; הִצִּיאוּהוּ 2 Sam. 14.30; הָלוּ 2 Sam. 13.28; all three instances in Ms. 105 JThS. — 6) Parallel forms to §59, cf. the Dictionary s. v. שָׁבַח.

B. In his *Masoreten des Westens* I. p. 46, Paul Kahle notes as a result of an evaluation of the Hebrew texts with the Palestinian vocalization, which he published there, three major deviations of general importance from the established rules of the Tiberian Hebrew Grammar; two of them have their parallel phenomena in the transliterations: 1) The nominal suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc. is *-ak* (and not *-ka*), cf. §124 subdivision 1; under subdivision 2 only two cases could be listed of an ending in *-ka*; cf. also ¶ XXVI f 1). — 2) The verbal forms of the 2. pers. sing. masc. of the perfect are vocalized according to a pronunciation *qatalit* (and not *qatalta*); cf. the §§3a, 27a, 42, 53a and 66. — At this occasion I wish to point out some more parallel developments of general importance between these two systems, which have not been noticed until now in the respective publications of Hebrew texts with PV. — 3) To the cases dealt with in the §§2a and 5a, namely: the retention of the second vowel in verbal formations, cf. וַיִּבְרָאֵה Jer. 30.18 (MdWI, p. א), וַיִּפְרָאֵה Hos. 14.8 (ib. p. ט); נָקַשׁ, abbreviated for נוֹקְשׁוּ Isa. 8.15 (Kahle in ZAW 1901, p. 281). — 4) To the respective §§ in chapter XIX: the noun remains unchanged in the construct state, cf. שְׁבוּתָה Jer. 30.18 (ib., p. א), דְּבָרִי Isa. 44.26 (ib. p. ר), וּמִקָּדְשׁוֹ Ps. 26.8 (ib., p. י) and בְּמִחְשְׁבוֹתָי (ib., p. ג, line 2). — 5) To §117 (cf. also paragraph XXVIe), cf. forms like: בָּבוֹאֵי (ib., p. יח, line 16), בָּטָל and בָּשִׁיר (Bar, p. 19); לָ, abbreviated for לְמַשְׁלָה Isa. 7.25 (Kahle

in ZAW 1901, p. 280). — 6) To the cases dealt with in paragraph XXVIa: retention of the original vowels in derived nominal forms, cf. *וְחִמְיָמָה* (MdWI, p. r, line 12); *וְלֹוִיִּים* (Edelmann, p. יא, line 23; three times!). — 7) To §10ba (and similarly in the Babylonian system, cf. above under subdivision A1), cf. *יְעִמְדֹרֵי* Dan. 11.14 (MdWII, p. 75). — 8) To §15a (cf. also ¶ XXVIa), cf. forms like: *יְעִי* Dan. 11.32 (ib., p. 76), *עִמְרִים* Dan. 12.5 (ib., p. 77), *זִצְצִי* (= *הַמַּצְצָפִים*) Isa. 8.19 (Kahle in ZAW 1901, p. 281). — 9) To §35: the prefix *מ* vocalized with *α*, cf. *מֶסֶ*, an abbreviation for *מֵאָחֲרֵי*, Isa. 5.11 (Kahle in ZAW 1901, p. 277). — 10) To §73 seq. (and similarly in the Babylonian system, cf. above under subdivision A 3), cf. *וְלֹחֲחִיךְ* Jer. 1.5 (MdWII, p. 78). — 11) To §118 cf. forms like *כָּרִ*, an abbreviation for *כְּדִבְרֵם*, Isa. 5.17; *בִּמְקֹה*, an abbreviation for *בְּמִלְקָהִים*, Isa. 6.6; *לֶמֶ*, an abbreviation for *לִמְרֵ*, Isa. 5.20; all three instances from Kahle, ZAW 1901. — 12) The forms listed in §79a need not necessarily be considered as waw consecutivum; cf. *וְרִיב* Ps. 55.10 (MdWII, p. 84), *וְבֹאֲרִי* Ps. 55.4 (ib., p. 83), *וְצִהֲרִים* Ps. 55.18 (ib., p. 84). — 13) To §23a: impv. forms with *ε* in the first syllable, cf. *חֲשֹׁב* (Edelmann, p. ח, line 1). — 14) To §55a, *δ* and §57: imperfect forms of the hiph'il with *ε* in the first syllable, cf. *יִסֵּב* Ex. 13.18 (Edelmann, p. ד, line 6). — 15) To §7bδ₃: 3. pers. sing. masc. of the imperfect of *verba primae gutturalis*, with *ε* in the first syllable, cf. *יְעוֹנֵב* Isa. 55.7 (Edelmann, p. יד, line 4). — 16) To §128: the suffix of the 2. pers. plur. masc. as *εχεμ*, cf. *רָצָה*, abbreviated for *מַעְרִיצְכֶם* Isa. 8.13 (Kahle in ZAW 1901, p. 281); cf. also paragraph XXVI f 2.

The parallels to the transliterations of *single words* in their various derivations, that can be found in Hebrew Bible texts with Babylonian or Palestinian vocalization, as differing from the Tiberian way of vocalizing these words, I have noted at the proper places in the Dictionary.

XXX. FORMATION OF THE NOUN

Nouns I have treated separately according to their masculine or feminine formation; not according to their grammatical gender, but rather according to the external criterion of their endings. Thus for instance *שם* *σηω* (*σεμαχ*, *σεμω*)—the derivatives of a

noun I bring in parenthesis—in §81 is listed as a masculine, whereas שם (semoth, *σεμωθαμ*) in §81a is given as a feminine *form* (not feminine noun!). This classification has a pragmatic sanction and may also be theoretically justified by the generalization of Jerome (editio Vallarsi, vol. IV., p. 10C): “Estque Hebraici characteris idioma, ut omnia, quae in syllabam finiuntur IM masculina sint, et pluralia, ut CHERUBIM et SERAPHIM. Et quae in OTH, feminina et pluralia, ut SABAOTH;” cf. similarly paragraph XIV.

XXXI. TRANSLITERATIONS AND RABBINIC STATEMENTS

In paragraph XXIX we believe to have established beyond any doubt the interrelation between the various non-Masoretic systems of pronunciation of Hebrew words. By applying the term “non-Masoretic” to these systems, we are afraid we might create the impression that they are thus discriminated against, denying them, so to say, the right of existence as compared with the authorised Masoretic system. We, therefore, wish to emphasize that the traditional terminology is wrong in both directions: The term Tiberian or Masoretic system is misleading, since it represents a combination of at least two different systems, as we have shown in paragraph XXVIII; and the classification of the non-Tiberian systems as non-Masoretic is incorrect, too; for there are quite a number of Rabbinic passages which can not be understood unless we refer to these non-Tiberian systems as the basic pronunciation of Hebrew of their days. I wish to illustrate this thesis by one example for each: the transliteration system and the Babylonian system: 1) In *מדרש בראשית רבה* editio Theodor (Berlin 1903 seq.) p. 70 on the verse: וירא אלהים את כל אשר עשה (Gen. 1.31) we read: בתורתו של רבי מאיר מצאו כתוב: והנה טוב מאד. This statement requires such a pronunciation of the two words *מאד* and *מות*, that they could phonetically be misunderstood for each other; the Tiberian vocalization as *מֵאָד* and *מָוֶת* excludes any such chance. But in the transliteration of the Second Column of the Hexapla *מאד* is rendered *μωδ* (Ps. 46.2) and *מות* *μωμ* (Ps. 49.15). The only difference between *μωδ*

and $\mu\omega\vartheta$, namely $\delta-\vartheta$, does not count; cf. paragraph XXIII sub τ , where 5 instances are brought to prove that τ at the end of the word was sometimes rendered by ϑ , so that even מאד could very likely have been pronounced as: $\mu\omega\vartheta$; cf. A. Marx in *JQR*, N. S. XIII (1923) p. 358. — 2) In the Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin fol. 5b we read: רבי למקום אחד וראה בני אדם שמוגבלים עיסותיהם בטומאה: אמר להם: מפני מה אחם מגבלים עיסותיכם בטומאה? אמרו לו: תלמיד אחד בא לכאן והורה לנו: מי בצעים אין מכשירין: "Once Rabbi came to a certain place and saw people kneading their dough in a state of impurity. Said he to them: Wherefore do ye knead your dough in impurity? They replied: A certain scholar came here and taught us: Water of the pond (מי בצעים) does not make fit for impurity. But he had really taught them: the liquid of eggs (מי ביצים) and they misunderstood him to say: water of the pond." On this passage Tossafoth remark: וחינו סבור מי בצעים, תימא: דהיאך טעו בין ביצים לבצעים? ואר"ת דאינו סבור דמי ביצים דקאמר דהיינו מי בצים. דכתיב (Job 8.11): הינאה גמא בלי בצה. וטעו בן בצים and מי ביצים: "It is surprising that they could err between מי ביצים and מי בצים? Said R. Tam: They thought that by saying מי ביצים he meant water of the pond, referring to the verse Job 8.11; they thus confused בצים (ponds) and ביצים (eggs)." R. Tam thus deviates from the wording of the Talmud by declaring a confusion of ביצים (eggs) and בצעים (ponds) too far fetched; he therefore substitutes the Hebrew words בצים for its Aramaic equivalent בצעים and finds a confusion between ביצים (eggs) and בצים (ponds) quite possible. According to the Tiberian system, they are vocalized ביצים (eggs) and בָּצִים (ponds); there does, therefore, still exist a difference in the pronunciation of these two words. Fortunately, the verse Job 8.11 referred to by R. Tam is preserved in the Babylonian vocalization in Ms. Ec 1 and the word in question is vocalized here as בָּצָה (MTK, p. 71), which corresponds exactly to the pronunciation of this word in the meaning: eggs. We now interpret the Talmudical passage thus: The scholar had taught: מי ביצים meaning: the liquid of eggs; his audience heard him very well, but misunderstood the etymology of his decision מי ביצים as meaning: water of the pond, having in mind the verse Job 8.11; cf. paragraph XX.

XXXII. TRANSLITERATIONS AND THE SEPTUAGINT

In paragraph IV I alluded to the fact that this monograph represents a continuation of a series of studies on the Septuagint, which I had begun by publishing my *Septuagintaprobleme* I. By applying the results of this study, as worked out especially in paragraph XXIII, to the Septuagint, we are in a position to differentiate between the various sources, by the combination of which an apparently uniform Septuagint text arose. Since this criterion has entirely been overlooked until now, I wish to substantiate my assertion by pointing out a few instances: Codex A of the Septuagint is composed of different portions, each of them belonging to different periods; cf. f. i. the transliteration of חָבֵר in 1 Chron. 7.31 as χαβερ and ib. 4.18 as αβερ; the explanation may be found in paragraph XXIII sub ה. — עֵזֶר is rendered in 1 Chron. 7.21 as εζερ (cf. §95) and ib. 12.9 as αζερ (cf. §94) — חָרֵן is in Gen. 29.4: χαρραν and ib. 11.27: αρραν (cf. paragraph XXIII sub ה). These examples are sufficient to prove that codex A, not only when considered as an entity covering the entire Bible, but even on the single Biblical books, goes back to different sources. The same is true of Codex B also, as may be seen from these examples: the word מְחֹלָה (in the connection אֲבֵל מְחֹלָה) is transliterated in 1 Kings 4.12 as μαωλα; ib. 19.16 as μαουλα and Jud. 7.22 as μεουλα. For explanation cf. paragraph XXIII sub ו (ω-ου) and sub ה (rendered as ε). — 2 Chron. 8.18: אֹפֶיֶת is rendered: εἰς Σωφειρα (read: εἰς Ωφειρα) and ib. 9.10: מְאֹפֶיֶת: ἐκ Σουφειρ (read: ἐξ Ουφειρ); cf. paragraph XXIII sub ו. It may be of interest to refer here to the similar conclusions we arrived at concerning the Hexapla of Origen (cf. paragraph V near the end) and the transliterations of Jerome (cf. paragraph IX). We thus realize that *one of the most significant criteria of the works of those early centuries is their mixed type*. And why should we blame those pious compilers or copyists for having overlooked apparent discrepancies, if these inner contradictions escaped the attention of the scholars until to-day, as is the case with the transliterations of the Septuagint and Origen; and as to Jerome, all we have until now is the general statement, unaccompanied by any evidence at all, which Franz X. Wutz makes in his book: *Die*

Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1925, p. 3): "Hieronymus ist nur mit grösster Vorsicht zu benützen, da er ein gewaltiges Sammelsurium von Formen aus allen Jahrhunderten eines Zeitraumes von 7–800 Jahren bot. Da Hieronymus trotz aller Gelehrsamkeit der historisch-kritische Blick für die Divergenz seiner Materialien fehlte, so häufte er Material auf Material ohne zu ahnen, um was es ging; ja er nahm oft Stellung gegen alte Formen, ohne zu wissen, wie sehr sie durch die alte Orthographie berechtigt waren." I do hope that the scholarly reader of this study will not find himself at a loss as Dr. Wutz does; but I am not so sure of it that it is entirely the fault of Jerome that Dr. Wutz could not find the key to an understanding of the systems underlying his transliterations. And as to Jerome's lack of a historical-critical sense—what an absurdity to expect it from an author of the beginning of the fifth century!

The mixed type as a characteristic feature we could also see, though in general outline only, in the Tiberian system; cf. paragraph XXVIII; the non-Masoretic systems represent it likewise, as became clear to me while going through the entire material to look out for parallel grammatical developments. In future, the *Hebrew Grammar* and the *Hebrew dictionary* will have to take these facts into account and to broaden their basis so as to *include all the material available*, without discriminating between Masoretic forms as authoritative and non-Masoretic forms merely to frame the work up scientifically; cf. the statement made in OLZ 1929, quoted at the beginning of paragraph XXIII.

XXXIII. TWO DIALECTS OF BIBLICAL HEBREW

1) Throughout this study we laid the main emphasis upon recording grammatical facts as preserved in these non-Masoretic evidences of pronunciation, and upon arranging and classifying them according to their own laws, the basis for which had to be found through inner criteria. No serious attempt has been made to explain the phenomena; the limited material at our disposal does not seem to be encouraging for any attempt of this kind. But there is even another consideration, which has to be taken

into account and which directly excludes the possibility of phonetic connections and interdependance of the variously pronounced grammatical forms.

While merely noting facts, we had to record a great many nominal and verbal forms, which belong to different formations according to the different systems of vocalization; f. i. שֶׁבֶט and שֶׁמֶשׁ are qitl-forms in the Tiberian system, but qatl-forms in the transliteration; vice versa דָּרַךְ and נָפֶשׁ are qatl-forms in the Tiberian system, but qitl-forms in the transliteration; the imperative to לָחֵם is in the Tiberian system לָחֵם (i. e. an imperfect with a), but λούμ in the transliteration (i. e. imperfect with o); the participle plur. of חָפַץ is חֹפְצִי in the Tiberian system, but ωφση in the transliteration. These and similar observations suggest the explanation that the two systems involved can not be considered as directly connected with each other, or one to be a later phonetic development of the other, but that they most definitely reflect a twofold way of pronouncing Hebrew. Both of them may go back to a common ancestor, which we would call *Original Hebrew* (Urhebraeisch); they represent two separate branches of this original, each one of them with a further phonetic development of its own.

And now the problem arises: can we account, in the historical development of Hebrew during the biblical period, for such an assumption of two independent pronunciations or dialects? I am inclined to answer this question in the affirmative and to regard the kingdoms of Israel and Judah respectively as the homelands of these dialectical differences.

2) In paragraph XIV we saw that the practice of the transliterations to make no differentiation between ש and שׁ (note especially the citations from Jerome referred to: Quaestiones on Gen. 26.12; 41.29) agrees with what we know as an Ephraimitic peculiarity of pronunciation; cf. Jud. 12.6. We, therefore, believe we are justified in ascribing the Tiberian way of differentiating between ש and שׁ to the Judaeen dialect. We hereby do not mean to generalize, stating that the transliterations as an entirety reflect the Israelitish pronunciation, while the Tiberian system in the same way follows the Judaeen dialect. Neither of these systems can be regarded as a whole, since they are lacking in

the first prerequisite: consistency; cf. paragraphs IV, V, IX, XV on the one hand, and paragraph XXVIII on the other. My assertion, therefore, is that by collecting all available evidences for the pronunciation of Hebrew, from Tiberian as well as from non-Tiberian sources, and by systematically arranging them according to the lines set up in this monograph, we may be able to arrive at conclusions concerning the most important characteristic features of the two dialects of Hebrew as a spoken language, namely the Israelitish and the Judaeen dialect.

3) To meet a possible argument that the mere fact that ש and שו were or were not differentiated can not be considered a solid basis for the assumption of dialectical differences between Israel and Judah in general, we wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to point out that a comparison between the Hebrew Pentateuch in its Masoretic form with Sam. will furnish us with a great many further differences of general importance. A few instances will suffice: To the inconsistency of the Tiberian system as discussed in paragraph XXVIII subdivision 4, cf. the following similar differences between MT and Sam.: Gen. 31.10: MT: וְאֶרְאָה Sam. וְאֶרְאָה ; Deut. 2.33: MT: וְנָכַח Sam. וְנֹכַח ; ib. 3.18: MT: וְאֶצִּי Sam. וְאֶצִּי . Similarly without shortening of the last syllable: Gen. 5.3: MT: וַיֹּלֶד Sam. וַיֹּלֶד ; ib. 24.28: MT: וַתֵּיֶד Sam. וַתֵּיֶד ; ib. 31.42: MT: וַיִּכַּח Sam. וַיִּכַּח . Formulating a rule based upon these facts we will say that according to the Samaritan usage the waw consecutivum does not at all affect the structure of the respective verbal form. At the very same conclusion we arrived while discussing the transliterations; cf. §78 and paragraph XXVII subdivision 3. We are thus led to the assumption that, generally speaking, the Samaritan Pentateuch represents the Hebrew Pentateuch in the Israelitish or *Samaritan recension*, while in the Masoretic text the Judaeen recension is mainly preserved.

We wish to emphasize that we are far from *identifying* the MT with the Judaeen, or Sam. with the Israelitish recension of the Hebrew Bible. Neither of them can be regarded now as representing its prototype in its original dialectical purity; the textual changes which they underwent in the various stages of their

redaction may have been instrumental, too, in eliminating here and there characteristic dialectic idioms. We can not even tell, when this process was finished; apparently at a somewhat late century; for we can prove that at least in one important passage Sam. offered as late as in the days of Jerome an entirely different reading from what we now have in all the manuscripts of this text. We discussed this problem in an article "The Targum Onkelos in its Relation to the Masoretic Hebrew text" (*PAAJR* VI, 1934-5, p. 312 seq.).

Keeping this in mind, we realize to what an extent the original text of Sam. may have been changed and modelled; a glimpse into the critical apparatus of Kennicott's *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford 1776-80) will convince us that the MT shared the same fate. And still I venture to say that by carefully comparing these two textual forms of the Heberw Pentateuch we may arrive at definite conclusions as to the characteristic features of the two Hebrew dialects which they mainly represent. I should like to demonstrate this with a few examples; for the practical benefit of the reader I vocalize some of the Samaritan readings, too, according to the Tiberian system: 1) Gen. 8.3: MT: וישבו הלוך . . . ושוב, Sam.: וישבו וישבו; ib., 5: הלוך וחסור, Sam.: היי . . . הלוך וחסור; ib., 7: ויצא ושוב, Sam.: ויצא ושב; ib. 12.9: הלוך . . . ויסע, Sam.: הלך ונסע. In MT a verbum finitum is continued by an infinitivus absolutus, while in the Samaritan Pentateuch it is followed by a verb in the very same tempus. — 2) Gen. 3.13: MT: עשית, Sam.: עשיתי; ib. 12.11: אף, Sam.: אחי; ib. 16.8: באף, Sam.: באתי; ib. 16.11: וילדת . . . וקראת, Sam.: וילדתי . . . וקראתי; ib. 18.15: צחקת, Sam.: צחקתי. The suffix of the 2. pers. fem. of the perfect is in MT: ת, but according to the Sam. — 3) Gen. 12.5: MT: ארצה, Sam.: ארץ; ib. 24.16: העינה, Sam.: העין; ib. 28.2: ביתה, Sam.: בית; Deut. 4.19: השמימה, Sam.: השמים. The MT has a locative with the ending ה, while in the Sam. the absolute form is used in this meaning. — 4) Gen. 6.17: MT: לשחת, Sam.: להשחית; cf. 9.11, 15; ib. 19.13: MT: לשחתה, Sam.: להשחיתה; ib. 19.29: MT: בשחת, Sam.: בהשחית; ib. 7.3: MT: לחיות, Sam.: להחיות; Deut. 6.19: MT: להדריך, Sam.: להדריף; ib. 9.4: MT: בקרף, Sam.: בהדריך. The Sam. shows a preference for the respective hiph'il forms of the verb.

We hope that we will be able to present the scholarly world in not too remote a future with a detailed evaluation of the Sam. from this point of view, and this approach will result—we are sure—in a new appreciation of the philology of the Bible in its various aspects.

Just a few instances to indicate what we have in mind: In paragraph XIV we could show the influence of the Israelitish dialect upon the language of Jeremiah; in addition to the proof of the pronunciation of ש and ש, which we discussed there, cf. forms like: לַפְדִּי Jer. 2.33; קָרָאִי ib. 3.4; דְּבַרְתִּי ib. 3.5, which belong to the group of verbal formations listed above under subdivision 2 as a characteristic of Sam. The same holds true of verbal forms with waw consecutivum like וַאֲשַׁקֶּה Jer. 25.17; וַיָּקֶה ib. 20.2; cf. above sub 3, near the beginning of the paragraph.

XXXIV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am under the most pleasant obligation to once again publicly acknowledge my deepest indebtedness to my teacher and friend Professor Paul Kahle for having taught me a free and unprejudiced approach to the problems of Hebrew Grammar, unhampered by the rules of the Masorites of Tiberias. I shall never forget those extended Sunday hikes in his company in the glorious surroundings of Bonn, a welcome opportunity for learned conversation, by which I profited more than I can say.

To Professor Kahle I also owe thanks for his suggestion to compare my material with Hebrew Bible texts with the Babylonian vocalization, which like the transliterations represents a system, independent of that of the Tiberians. For this purpose he put at my disposal his unique collection, containing copies of a large number of fragments of Hebrew Bible Mss. with BV covering a very considerable part of the Bible which come from the Geniza of Cairo and are now scattered over various libraries; cf. his Catalogue, cited in paragraph XXIV. I went very carefully through this collection, and after having examined all the fragments I was happy to find there many parallel forms.

My friend Professor Alexander Marx was kind enough to read large parts of this monograph in manuscript form. He also called

my attention to the Ms. 105 of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, which proved to be very useful.

I am further indebted to Professors Eugen Mittwoch and Ismar Elbogen, through whose recommendation this monograph of mine was awarded the Zunz-Prize for 1933. Likewise I wish to thank the Board of Editors of the Hebrew Union College Annual who, acting on the suggestion of President Dr Julian Morgenstern, consented to include this study in their publications. Dr. Sheldon H. Blank has put me under great obligation by assisting me in reading the proofs.

ADDENDA

P. 3, l. 1, after the word "material": (after E. A. Speiser in *JQR*, NS XVI [1926], pp. 343-382 and XXIII [1933], pp. 233-265 had dealt with the subject from the point of view of Comparative Semitic Phonetics).

P. 13, last line: cf. similarly paragraph XXX.

P. 26, l. 5 from end: For the later Greek confusion with *ou* cf. Dictionary s. v. *ου*.

P. 29, l. 1, after "χ and κ": Cf. Mayser, §36, I, 2).

P. 29, l. 10 fr. bot., after "παθα": Cf. Mayser, §36, II, 1).

P. 30, l. 19, after "sound": Cf. Mayser, §11, I.

A HEBREW GRAMMAR

The subdivisions (α , β , γ or 1, 2, 3 respectively) separate the sound roots from the various types of weak stems, where one consonant of the stem is apparently missing in the transliteration, as expounded in the Introduction, paragraph XXIII, sub. א, ה, ה and ע.

THE VERB

I. KAL

A. PERFECT

§1: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

a) Sound Verbs:

<p>בָּרַךְ <i>baraχ</i> G זָכַר <i>zaχap</i> A יָשַׁב <i>iasaβ</i> O נָדַב <i>naδaβ</i> G</p>	<p>נָתַן <i>naθan</i> G סָמַךְ <i>samaχ</i> A, <i>samak</i> B סָפַן <i>sapañ</i> G, שָׁפַט <i>šapaṭ</i> G</p>
--	---

b) Verbs with a Guttural:

<p>a) אָחַז <i>aχas</i> B, <i>aχaζ</i> G, <i>aaζ</i> A אָמַר <i>amaρ</i> G אָסַף <i>asaφ</i> G אָשַׁם <i>asam</i> הָלַךְ <i>alaχ</i> O הָנַן <i>anañ</i> G הָשַׁב <i>asaβ</i> G</p>	<p>אָזַר <i>aζap</i> G ב) אָזַן <i>jaśa</i> פָּדַח <i>paδa</i> G קָנָה <i>kana</i> G קָנָנִי <i>canani</i> ג) הָעַל <i>haaλ</i> A δ) הָיָה <i>aea</i> O, <i>haja</i> הָיָה <i>aζa</i> G</p>
--	--

הנה	hana	אָנאָ	אנאμ O
הרה	ara	אָסאָ	אסא G
אָנאָ	אנא A	הָרָה	raha

c) Verba med. ו and י:

אָנאָ	βα O	קאָ	καμ G
דאָ	δαν A	רָד	rad
		אָסאָ	σαμ O

d) Verba tertiae η and υ:

a) דלע	βαλα A	β) דָרָה	ζαραε A
דלעם	βαλααμ G	דע	ιαδαε B
דָרָה	ζαרא A	שמע	σαμαε B
דָרָה	παθα B, φαθα A	γ) דָרָה	βατε O
דע	ιαδα A	דָרָה	ζαρε B
שמע	σαμα G	שמע	same

§2: 3. pers. sing. fem.:

a) With retention of the second vowel:

דָרָה	νααθα O	אָנאָ	anatha
	רָאָה	ρααθα O	

b) With loss of the second vowel:

אָסאָ אססא O

§3: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

a) Ending in a Consonant:

a ₁) דפּדָה	αφαχθ O	a ₂) דָרָה	ζαναθ O
דפּדָה	μαγαρθ O	דע	ιαδαθ O
דפּדָה	ναθαθ O	דָרָה	carath
דפּדָה	φαρασθ O	שמע	σαμαθ O

β_1) פֶּרִית <i>φαδιθ</i> ○	β_2) רֵאִית <i>ραιθ</i> ○
שָׂרִית <i>sarith</i>	ג) שָׁמַת <i>σαμθ</i> ○
δ) קִלּוֹת <i>calloth</i>	

b) Ending in a Vowel:

א) בִּרְאָה <i>βαραθα</i> ○	צִפְנִית <i>σ αφανθα</i> ○
פְּעֵלָה <i>φααλθα</i> ○	β) רֵאִיתָה <i>ραειθα</i> ○

§4: 1. pers. sing.:

א) אֶמְרָתִי <i>αμαρτι</i> ○	חֲסִיתִי <i>ασιθ</i> ○
בִּטְחָתִי <i>βαραθ</i> ○	קִנִּיתִי <i>canithi</i>
עֲבָרָתִי <i>abarthi</i>	רֵאִיתִי <i>raithi</i>
פְּקָדָתִי <i>φακαδθ</i> ○	ג) שְׁנֵאתִי <i>σ ανηθ</i> ○
קִרְאָתִי <i>καραθ</i> ○	δ) שְׁחֹתִי <i>σεωθ</i> ○
β) הִנֵּיתִי <i>αιθ</i> ○	ε) שָׁמַתִי <i>σαμθ</i> ○

§5: 3. pers. plur.:

a) With retention of the second vowel (cf. B-L. §2w):

דָּקָרוּ <i>dacaru</i>	יָדָעוּ <i>jadau</i>
מָאָדוּ <i>μααδου</i> ○	

b) With loss of the second vowel:

אָמְרוּ <i>αμου</i> ○	כָּחְשׁוּ <i>chaesu</i>
טָמְנוּ <i>ταμνου</i> ○	עָזְבוּ <i>αζβου</i> ○

c) Defective verbs:

א) בָּאוּ <i>bau</i>	שָׁמְחוּ <i>σ αμου</i> ○
הָמוּ <i>αμου</i> ○	שָׁתוּ <i>σ αθου</i> ○
מָטוּ <i>ματου</i> ○	β) דָּמוּ <i>δαμμου</i> ○
רָאוּ <i>rau</i>	ג) שָׁסוּ <i>σ ασσου</i> ○

§6: 2. pers. plur. masc.:

אָרַשְׁתֶּם <i>arasthem</i>

B. IMPERFECT

§7: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

a) With vocalic prefix:

א) יִרַע	ισρα B, ιζρα A	יִצְהָר	ισααρ A
יִמְנַע	ιμνα G	יִצְחָק	ισαακ G
יִקְרָא	ικρα O	יִשְׁחָק	isaac
יִקְרָאנִי	ικραηνι O	ג) יִקָּר	ικαρ O
יִשְׁמַע	ισμα A	יִשָּׁר	isar
ב) יִבְחַר	ιβααρ B	ד) יִשְׂרָף	ισροφ O
יִנָּאֵל	ιγααλ B	יִסּוּבְכֵנִי	ισωβαβεννου O

b) With consonantal prefix:

א) יִבְלַע	ιεβλα G	ד ₄) יִעֲקֹב	ιακωβ G
יִגְדַּל	iegdal	ε) יִגּוּר	ιαγουρ A
יִדְלֶף	ιεδλαφ A	יָנוּם	ιανουμ A
יִזְרַע	ιεζρα A	יָקוּם	jaccum
יִקְלָא	ιεμλα A	יָרוּם	ιαρουμ O
יִמְנָה	ιεμνα A	יָשׁוּב	ιασουβ G
יִפְתַּח	ιεφθα A	ז) יָבֹוא	ιαβω O
יִקְבֵּעַ	jecba	יָדוּם	ιαδομ O
יִרְפָּא	ιερφα A	יָכוֹן	ιεχχον O
יִתְלָה	ιεθλα A	η ₁) יִהְיֶה	ιειε O
ב) יִחְבֹּל	ιεβαλ O	יִחְיֶה	ιειε O
יִחְדַּל	יעדאל O	יִרְאֶה	ιερε O
ג ₁) יִנָּאֵל	iegal	יִרְעַם	ιερημ O
יִנְהָר	יעגאר O	η ₂) יִפְתַּח	iepte
יִשָּׂאג	jesag	יִפְדֵּה	ιεφδε O
ג ₂) יִבְחַר	יעבאאר A	η ₃) יִרַד	jered
יִצָּהָר	iessaar	יִשָּׁב	ιησηβ O
ד ₁) יִשְׁבֹּק	ιεσβוק A	η ₄) יִגְדַּל	יעגδελ O
ד ₂) יִזְבֻּלֵנִי	iezbuleni	יִתֵּן	ιευθεν O
ד ₃) יִחְרֹשׁ	jeros	ו) יִרְחַ	ιεσραε B

יִפְתַּח ιεφθαε G

§8: 3. pers. sing. fem. = 2. pers. sing. masc.:

a) With *a* in the first syllable:

a) תַּמְנָה	θαμνα A	β) תַּרְחַק	θαρακ O
תַּמְנַע	θαμνα A	γ) תַּמּוֹג	θαμουγ O
תַּפְסַח	θαψα A	תַּשׁוּב	θασουβ O
תַּרְצָה	θαρσα B	δ) תַּהֲנֶה	θααγε O

b) With *ε* in the first syllable:

a) תַּרְצָה	θερσα G	תַּלְךְ	θηληχ O
β) תַּבְעֵר	θεβαρ O	δ) תַּתֵּן	θεθθεν O
תַּמְאֵס	θεμας O	תַּצְרֵי	θεσσερηני O
תַּסְפְּרֵי	θεσαδηνι O	ε) תַּפֵּל	thephhol
β ₁) תַּצֵּר	θεσαρ O	תַּאֲרֵי	θεξορηני O
γ) תַּרְאֶה	θερε O	ε ₁) תַּמוּט	θεμμουτ O
ε ₂) תַּצְנִים θισφνημ O			

c) Miscellaneous forms:

וַתֵּט	ουθετ O	תַּסּוּבְנִי	θσωβαβηני O
--------	---------	--------------	-------------

§9: 1. pers. sing.:

a) אֶמְסָא	emsa	γ ₁) אֶעֱבֹר	eebor
אֶפְתָּח	εφθα O	אֶמְחָצֵם	εμωσημ O
אֶקְרָא	εκρα O	אֶשְׁקֵם	εσοקהμ O
אֶשְׁמַח	εσμα O	δ) אֶרוּם	αρουμ O
β) אֶשְׁעֵן	εσαν A	אֶרְץ	αρουס O
אֶהֱבֶהוּ	εαβηου O	אֶשׁוּב	ασουβ O
γ) אֶנְכֹר	ηζχορ O	ε) אֶרְאֵה	ερα O
אֶרְדּוּף	ερδοφ O	אֶגִּילָה	αγילה O
אֶשְׁמֹר	εσμωρ O	ז) אֶרְוִמֶמֶחַ	ερωμεμεח O
אֶשְׁפּוֹחַ	esphoch	אֶתְנֶהוּ	εθνηου O

§10: 3. pers. plur. masc.:

a) With vocalic prefix:

יַחֲפְרוּ	εφρου O	יַסְבִּי	ισαββουνι O
יַחֲרְדּוּ	εχαρδου O	יַקְרִצוּ	ικερσου O

b) With consonantal prefix:

a) יבשו	ιηβωσου ο	יִקְרוּ	ιεμρου ο
יִקְרוּ	ιερογου ο	יָבִלוּ	ιεβλου ο
יָפִלוּ	ιεφφολου ο	יִשְׁמְחוּ	ιεσμου ο
יִשְׁמְרוּ	ιεσμωρου ο	ד) יַעֲזְבוּ	ιεζεβου ο
β) יָמוּתוּ	ιαμωθου ο	יִשְׁמְחוּ	ιεσεμου ο
יָרָצוּ	ιαροσου ο	יָהֲמוּ	ιεεμου ο
יָרְצוּ	ιαροννου ο	ε) יַרְעִשׁוּ	ιερασουι ο
β ₁) יָשׁוּבוּ	jasubu	יִתְקַחוּ	jethmau
γ) יִתְּנוּ	jeju	ז) יֵאָבְדוּ	ιοβαδου ο
	ζ ₁) יֵאָקְרוּ	ιωμρου ο	

§11: 2. pers. plur. masc.:

תִּתְּנוּ	θου ο	תִּתְּמוּ	thamoddu
	θεσου ο		

§12: 1. pers. plur.:

יִתְּנָא νιπα ο

C. PARTICIPLE

§13: *ptc. act. sing. masc.*:

a) בּוֹטֵחַ	βωτη ο	נֹצֵר	νωσηρ ο
בּוֹקֵר	bocer	נֹתֵן	νωθην ο
גּוֹאֵל	goel	סֹפֵר	sopher
גּוֹדֵר	goder	עֹזֵר	ωζηρ ο
דֹּאֵג	δωηγ A, δωηκ B	עֹשֶׂה	ωση ο
חֹרֵב	χωρηβ G, oreb	קוֹלֵעַ	colea
יֹעֵץ	ioes	קוֹרֵא	κωρη G
יֹזֵר	joser	רֹגֵל	ρωγηλ G
לֹחֵץ	λωης G	רֹעֶה	roe
נֹגֵשׁ	noges	שׁוֹאֵף	soeph
עֹבֵד	ωβηδ G, obeth	שׁוֹבֵק	σωβηκ G
עֹדֵד	ωδηδ B	שׁוֹמֵר	σωμηρ G

שָׂקֶד	soced	זֶלֶם	σαλημ o
β) קָפַץ	αφης o	γ) גָּר	gar
יָרָא	ιαρη o	רָם	ραμ G

§14: *ptc. act. sing. fem.:*

א) זִהְלַח	ζωελεθ A	זִהְלַח	coeleth
יֹזֶבֶב	josebeth	β) הִמָּה	homa
		γ) הִמָּה	ραμα G

§15: *ptc. act. plur. masc. (cf. B-L. §26t):*

a) With retention of the second vowel (cf. B-L. §14f):

בָּטְחִים	βωττειμ o	נִקְדִּים	nocedim
חִלְמִים	ωλεμιμ o	פֹּהֲזִים	phoezim
מִשְׁכִּים	mosechim	רִנְגִּים	ρωγελειμ A

b) With loss of the second vowel (cf. B-L. §26t):

א) אֲרָגִים	ωργειμ G	צֹפִים	σωφιμ A
שָׁמְרִים	σωμριμ o	רֹעִים	roim
β) חֲסִים	ωσιμ o	γ) רָצִים	ρασειμ A

§16: *ptc. act. plur. fem.:*

רִמּוֹחַ ραμωθ A

§17: *Inflected forms of the act. ptc.:*

א) גֹּזִי	gozi	מִשְׁכֵּי	mosche
רֹעִי	roi	חֲפָצִי	ωφση o
β) לִחְמִי	λωαμαι o	עֲבָדִי	ωβρη o
קָמִי	καμαι o	שֹׁנְאִי	σωνη o
γ) יֹרְדִי	ιωρδη o	δ) בֹּנֵיךְ	bonaich
		לִירְאִיךְ	λiriaχ o

§18: *pass. ptc. sing. masc.:*

בָּרוּךְ	βαρουχ G	זָבוּד	ζαβουθ B
אָמוּל	γαμουλ B	חָמוּל	amul

חֲנוּן	αγουν G	פִּקוּד	phacud
חֲרוּץ	αρους G	פִּרוּחַ	φαρρου A
סָמוּךְ	samuch	צָפֹן	σαφουν O
סָתוּר	σαθουρ G	רְפוּא	ραφου G
עֶזוּר	azur	שְׂאוּל	σαουλ A
עֶצוּם	ασουμ O	שְׂדוּד	sadud

§19: *pass. ptc. sing. fem.:*

a) With retention of the vowel after the first radical:

בְּרוּרָה	barura	עֲזוּבָה	αζουβα A
חֲשֻׁבָה	ασουβε B	צְרוּעָה	σαρουα A
סְנוּאָה	σανουα A	שְׁלֻחָה	salua

b) With ε after the first radical:

נְחוּשָׁה	νεουσα O	צְרוּפָה	σερουφα O
		שְׁלֻחָה	selua

c) With elision of the first vowel:

בְּעוּלָה	bula	דְּרוּשָׁה	drusa
-----------	------	------------	-------

§20: *pass. ptc. plur. masc.:*

a) With retention of the vowel after the first radical:

אֲסוּרִים	assurim	לְטוּשִׁים	latusim
-----------	---------	------------	---------

b) With ε after the first radical:

אֲמוּנִים εμουνιμ O

§21: *Inflected forms of the pass. ptc.:*

a) חֲלָצִי	eluse	β) עֲקָבִי	ακοββαι O
נִצְרוּרִי	nesure	רְוַעֲתִי	ζερωωνται O

D. IMPERATIVE

§22: *impv. sing. masc.:*

α) זָכַר	ζαορ ο	שָׁמַע	σμα ο, σμαε ο
לָחַם	λοομ ο	γ) קוּם	κουμ ο
β) קָרָא	εζακ ο	δ) רִיבָה	ριβα ο
		ε) הִיָּה	αιη ο

§23: *impv. plur. masc.:*

α) בָּטְחוּ	βετου ο	γ) אָבֹוּ	αβου ο
זָזוּ	εεζου ο	הָבֹוּ	αβου ο
קָרְאוּ	κερου ο	δ) לָכֹוּ	λχου ο
שָׁמְחוּ	σεμου ο	רָאוּ	ρου Α
שָׁמְעוּ	semu	דָּעוּ	δου ο .
β) יָלֹוּ	γιλου ο	ε) רָעוּ	rou
שָׁמְעוּ	σιμου ο	ζ) הָדִלֹוּ	hedalu

E. INFINITIVE

§24: *inf. abs.:*

α) נָזַח	ζανω Α, zanoē	קָרַב	καρωβ ο
הָבֹור	αβωρ G	β) בּוּז	buz
קָרַק	αρωκ ο	חָוַל	ουλ Α
פָּדַה	φαδω ο	צוּד	sud
		קוּם	κουμ ο

§25: *inf. constr.:*

a) With prefix:

α) לָבֹלוּם	λαβλωμ ο	לָפְנוּחַ	λαφνωθ ο
לָמָצַח	λαμσω ο	β) לְבֹא	λαβω Β
		בָּמוּט	βαμωτ ο

b) With suffix:

α) בָּוִי	βουζει G	בָּהָפִי	βααφζι ο
שָׂאֲתִי	σαδι ο	בָּרָדְתִי	βρεδεθι ο
β) בָּשׁוּרִי	basori	בָּהִלְוֹתִים	βααλωθαμ ο

II. PI'EL

A. PERFECT

§26: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

מָרַם	εμμηρ	G	שָׂרַם	εκκης	A
לָרַם	γεδδηλ	A	רָסַר	κεσσης	O
לָלַר	ελληλ	B	סָרַם	σελλημ	A

§27: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

a) Ending in a consonant:

רָלַר	ελλελθ	O	רָרַר	νherθ	O
	רָרַם	σεμεθ	O		

b) Ending in a vowel:

רָרַר	φειθεα	O	רָרַר	δελλιθανη	O
	רָרַר	ιθανι	O		

§28: 1. pers. sing.:

רָרַר	γεδδελθι	A	רָרַר	μελληθι	A
	רָרַר	εννηθι	O		

§29: 3. pers. plur.:

רָרַר	ηρφου	O
-------	-------	---

§30: 1. pers. plur.:

רָרַר	δεμμηνου	O	רָרַר	βελλεנוνου	O
-------	----------	---	-------	------------	---

B. IMPERFECT

§31: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

a) With vocalic prefix:

רָרַר	ιδαββερ	O	רָרַר	ιζαμμερεχ	O
	רָרַר	ιμαλλετ	O		

b) With consonantal prefix:

דָּבַר יֵדָאββερ ο לָלֵךְ יֵאֵללֵל A

§32: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

א) וְהָיָה לְךָ οὐνεθάζερνι ο וְהָיָה לְךָ οὐθνεελνι ο

β) וְהָיָה לְךָ θεσσαβερ ο

§33: 1. pers. sing.:

α) לָלֵךְ אֶדָλλεγ ο γ) לָלֵךְ אֶελλελεχ ο

 אֶנָּסֶס enasse δ) לָלֵךְ אֶσσανε ο

β) לָלֵךְ אֶαλλελ ο ρ) לָלֵךְ אֶσσακερ ο

 אֶמָּגְנַח amaggenach ε) לָלֵךְ אֶχαζεβ ο

§34: 3. pers. plur. masc.:

a) With vocalic prefix:

וְהָיָה לָהֶם ιδαββηρου ο

b) With consonantal prefix:

וְהָיָה לָהֶם ιαλληχουν ο וְהָיָה לָהֶם ιαλληλουν ο

 וְהָיָה לָהֶם ιεσανου ο

C. PARTICIPLE

§35: *ptc. act. sing. masc.:*

α) מְלַמֵּד מַαλαμμεδ ο β) מְנַחֵם מַαναημ G

 מְנַחֵם מַανασση ο מְנַחֵם maphate

 מְנַחֵם מַανασση B; מְנַחֵם אֶμμααζερνι ο

 מְנַחֵם מַαννασση A γ) מְנַחֵם μοςσανε ο

 מְנַחֵם mopheph

§36: *ptc. act. sing. fem.:*

מְרַחֵף marahaefeth

§37: *pic. act. plur. masc.:*

הַמִּיחֲלִים *amμηαλιμ* ο *אִשְׁמִי* *ουμασσανει* ο

D. IMPERATIVE

§38: *impv. sing. masc.:*

α) *אִשְׁמִי* *νεσσημ* ο *בָּרֵךְ* *βαρεχ* ο
פֶּלֶטִי *φελλετηνι* ο *סַדְעֵנִי* *sadecenu*
 γ) *הִיֵּהוּ* *heieu*

§39: *impv. plur. masc.:*

הָלֵלִי *allelu* *וְהָרִי* *ζωημερου* ο

E. INFINITIVE

§40: *inf. constr.:*

α) *פֶּנּוּחַ* *φεννωθ* ο *טָפַל* *φαλητ* ο
כְּלִיחַ *χελλωθαμ* ο *לְבָלֵל* *λαβαλωθ* ο
 β) *כִּסּוּחַ* *χεσσουσθ* ο *בְּשִׁי* *βασανει* ο

III. NIPH'AL

A. PERFECT

§41: *3. pers. sing. masc.:*

נִשְׁמַל *νεμσαλ* ο *נִשְׁמַל* *νωαδ* A

§42: *2. pers. sing. masc.:*

נִשְׁבַּחְתָּ *νεσβαθ* ο

§43: *1. pers. sing.:*

α) *נִשְׁתַּלְתִּי* *νεζαρθι* ο *נִשְׁבַּחְתִּי* *νεσβαθι* ο
נִשְׁתַּלְתִּי *neptalti* *נִשְׁתַּלְתִּי* *νεγρεσθι* ο

§44: 3. pers. plur.:

נִפְסוּ נֶעְסָאֵפּוּ O

נִדְמוּ נֶעְדְמוּ O

B. IMPERFECT

§45: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

יִלָּה illaue

C. PARTICIPLE

§46: *ptc. sing. masc.:*

a) נִבְהַל נֶעֱבָאֵל O

נִחָשַׁב nesab

נִתְעַב nethab

β) נִאֲמַן נֶעֱמָאֵן O

γ) נִמָּצָא נֶעֱמָסָא O

δ) נִשְׁפָּה נֶעֱשְׁפָה

§47: *ptc. sing. fem.:*

נִאֲמָנָה נֶעֱמָאֵנָה O

נִעְלָמָה naalma

נִמְרָצָה nimrezeth

§48: *ptc. plur. masc.:*

נִעְמָנִים neemanim

IV. PU'AL

A. IMPERFECT

§49: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

a) With vocalic prefix:

יִשְׁבֵּר יֶסוּבֵּר O

b) With consonantal prefix:

יִרְחֹם יֶרְחֹאֵם A

יִפְנֶה יֶפְנֹנְהֵי G

B. PARTICIPLE

§50: *ptc. sing. masc.:*

מחולל	molal	מְשָׁלֵם	μεσουλαμ	G
המסכן	amsuchan			

§51: *ptc. plur. masc.:*

מְעוֹנִים μουνειμ A

V. HIPH'IL

A. PERFECT

§52: *3. pers. sing. masc.:*

α) הכין	hechin	הרעים	εριμ	ο
הפליא	εφλι	ο	β) העליק	εελικ
			ο	
		העלים	eelim	

§53: *2. pers. sing. masc.:*

a) Ending in a consonant:

α) הקצרת	εκσερθ	ο	β ₁) העלית	εελθ	ο
השבת	εσβεθ	ο	β ₂) העמדת	εεμεδεθ	ο
השמחת	εσμεθ	ο	γ) הרימות	αρημωθ	ο
β) העטית	εετηθ	ο	γ ₁) הקמחו	ακιμωθω	ο

b) Ending in a vowel:

הסתרת	εσθερθα	ο	הסתרתי	εσγερθανι
-------	---------	---	--------	-----------

B. IMPERFECT

§54: *3. pers. sing. masc.:*

a) Verba mediae ו and י:

α) יָאִיר	ιαειρ	G	יָכִין	ιαχειν	G
יָבִין	ιαβειν	B	יָקִים	ιακειμ	G
יָזִין	ιαζειζ	B	יָרִיב	ιαρειβ	A

יָשִׁיב	ιασειβ A	יָרִיב	ιαριβ A
β) יָבִין	ιαβιν O	γ) יָאִיר	iair
יָלִין	ιαλιν O		יָכִין iachin
יָפִיעַ	ιαφיע A		יָקִים iacim
		יָשִׁיר	jasir

b) Miscellaneous forms:

a) יוֹאֵל	ιωηλ G	β) יָגִיד	ιαγγιδ O
יוֹסֵף	ιωσηφ G	β ₁) יַעֲמִידָנִי	ιαμιδני O
α ₁) יוֹדָה	ιωδεχα O	γ) יָגִיה	ιαγι O

§55: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

a) תִּשְׁפִּיל	θεσφιλ O	γ) תִּאִיר	θαιρ O
תִּסְתִּיר	θεσθερ O		תִּשְׁיב θασιβ O
תִּסְתִּירֶמָּה	θεσθירקה O	δ) תִּנְחִנִּי	θενני O
α ₁) תִּרְחִיב	θεριβ O		תִּרְבִּנִי θερβני O
β) תוֹשִׁיעַ	θωσι O	ε) תִּקְרֵשׁ	θαρע O
תוֹצִיאֲנִי	θωσιנה O	ζ) תוֹתֵר	θωθαρ O

§56: 1. pers. sing.:

a) אָפִיר	αφיר O	γ) אֹדֶד	ωδεχ O
אֶצְמִיתָם	ασμιθαυμ O		אֹרֶךְ ωρεχ O
β) אֶשְׁכִּילֶךָ	εσχιλεχ O	δ) אֶהְדָּנוּ	αωδενנו O
אֶשִׁינָם	εσιγημ O	ε) אָטָה	αττε O

§57: 3. pers. plur. masc.:

יָגִיעוּ	יγγיו O	יָרְחִיבוּ	יεριβου O
	יִשְׁפִּיקוּ jespichu		

§58: 2. pers. plur. masc.:

תְּלִינוּ thalinu

C. PARTICIPLE

§59: *ptc. sing. masc.:*

משמים	masmím	מִשְׁבִּית	μισβιθ	ο
		מושיע	μωσι	ο

§60: *ptc. sing. fem.:*

מִינֶקֶה	meneca	מִנְקֶה	meneceth	
----------	--------	---------	----------	--

§61: *ptc. plur. masc.:*

מגדילים	μαγδιλιμ	ο	מושיעים	mosim
---------	----------	---	---------	-------

D. IMPERATIVE

§62: *impv. sing. masc.:*

a) הקיץ	ακισα	ο	β) הטה	εττη	ο
השיבה	ασιβα	ο	החוק	εεζεκ	ο
הצליחה נא	ασλιαννα	ο	β ₁) הצילני	εσιληνι	ο
העירה	αιρα	ο	γ) הושיעה	ωσια	ο
α ₁) הרם	αρημ	ο	γ ₁) הושיעה נא	ωσιεννα	ο

§63: *impv. plur. masc.:*

a) הרנינו	ερνινου	ο	β) הרפו	αρφου	ο
האזינו	eezinu		γ) הודו	ωδου	ο

E. INFINITIVE

§64: a) *inf. abs.:*

הבין	αβιν	ο	הצנע	esne	
------	------	---	------	------	--

b) *inf. constr.:*

בהמיר	βααμip	ο	להושיעני	λωσιηνι	ο
-------	--------	---	----------	---------	---

VI. HOPH'AL

IMPERFECT

§65: 3. pers. sing. masc.:

יִבֹּל יוּבֹאֵל A

VII. HITHPA'EL

A. PERFECT

§66: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

תִּבְרַח תִּבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O

§67: 1. pers. sing.:

יִבְרַח יִבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O

B. IMPERFECT

§68: 2. pers. sing. masc.:

תִּבְרַח תִּבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O תִּבְרַח תִּבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O
 תִּבְרַח תִּבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O

§69: 1. pers. sing.:

יִבְרַח יִבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O

§70: 3. pers. plur. masc.:

יִבְרַח יִבְרַח עִבְרַח עִבְרַח O

C. PARTICIPLE

§71: ptc. plur. fem.:

מִתְבַּרְחִים methnosasoth

D. IMPERATIVE

§72: *impv. plur. masc.:*

. יהשתחו עשׂאנוּ ׀

VIII. VERBAL FORMS WITH SUFFIXES

§73: *suffix of the 1. pers. sing.:* *ni:*a) With helping vowel *η*:

א) יִבְּלֵנִי	iezbuleni	פִּלְטֵנִי	φελλετηνι ׀
תִּסְעֲדֵנִי	θεσαδηνι ׀	יַעֲמִידֵנִי	יעמידηνι ׀
תִּצְרֵנִי	θεσσερηνι ׀	תִּנְחֵנִי	θενηνι ׀
תִּאָּזְרֵנִי	θεζορηνι ׀	תִּרְבֵּנִי	θερβηνι ׀
תִּסּוֹבְבֵנִי	θσωβαβηνι ׀	הִצִּילֵנִי	εσιληνι ׀
וְתִאָּזְרֵנִי	ουεθαζερηνι ׀	יִקְרָאֵנִי	ικραηνι ׀
הִתְאָּזְרֵנִי	αμμααζερηνι ׀	תוֹצִיאֵנִי	θωσιηνι ׀
	לְהוֹשִׁיעַנִי	λωσιηνι ׀	

b) Without a helping vowel:

א) יִסְבֵּנִי	ισαβουνι ׀	β) חִייתִנִי	ιθανι ׀
קָנִי	canani	הִסְגֵּרְתִּי	εσγερθανι ׀
	β ₁) דְּלִיתִי	δελλιθανη ׀	

§74: *suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc.:*

εχ, ach (cf. ¶ XXVI f 3), χα:

א) אֶרְוַמֶּכֶךְ	ερωμεμεχ ׀	אֶוֹרֶךְ	ωδεχ ׀
יִזְאָמֶרֶךְ	ιζαμμερεχ ׀	אֶוֹרֶךְ	ωρεχ ׀
אֶלְלֶלֶךְ	ελλελεχ ׀	β) אֶמַגֶּנֶךְ	amaggenach
אֶשְׁכִּילֶךְ	εשכילעח ׀	γ) יֶוֹדֶךְ	יωδεχχα ׀

§75: *suffix of the 3. pers. sing. masc.:* *ou, ω:*

א) יִסּוֹבְבֵנוּ	ισωβαβειννου ׀	חֵהוּ	heieu
אֶוֹדֵנוּ	αωδεννου ׀	γ) שֶׁהוּ	σασουου ׀
β) אֶתְנֵהוּ	εθνηου ׀	בִּלְעִנְהוּ	βελλενουου ׀
אֶתְהֵהוּ	εαβηου ׀	δ) הִקְמַתוּ	ακιμωθω

§76: *suffix of the 1. pers. plur.: ενου:*

וְקָנִי sadecenu

§77: *suffix of the 3. pers. plur. masc.: ημ, αμ:*

א) וְקָנִי	εμωσημ ο	וְקָנִי	νεσσημ ο
וְקָנִי	εσοκημ ο	וְקָנִי	εσιγημ ο
וְקָנִי	θεσθιρημ ο	β) וְקָנִי	αναμ ο
וְקָנִי	θισφνημ ο	וְקָנִי	βαλααμ G
וְקָנִי	ιερημ ο	וְקָנִי	ασμιθαυμ ο

IX. WAW CONJUNCTIVUM AND WAW CONSECUTIVUM

§78: *Transliterated as ov (cf. ¶ XXVII 3):*

a) Before a consonant:

וְקָנִי	ουνααθ α ο	וְקָנִי	ουγιλου ο
וְקָנִי	ουφακαθ θι ο	וְקָנִי	ουκεσσης ο
וְקָנִי	uraithi	וְקָנִי	ουθνεελνι ο
וְקָנִי	ουσαμ θι ο	וְקָנִי	ουβαρεχ ο
וְקָנִי	ουθεθ θεν ο	וְקָנִי	ουνεσσημ ο
וְקָנִי	ουθεζορηνι ο	וְקָנִי	ουνεζαρ θι ο
וְקָנִי	ουκουμ ο	וְקָנִי	ουνεεσαφου ο

b) Before a vowel:

וְקָנִי	ουεσοκημ ο	וְקָנִי	ουαρημ ο
וְקָנִי	ουεσμα ο	וְקָנִי	ουωδου ο
וְקָנִי	ουεσιγημ ο	וְקָנִי	ουωρεχ ο
וְקָנִי	ουερνινου ο	וְקָנִי	ουικα ρ ο
וְקָנִי	ουεαβηου ο	וְקָנִי	ουικρα ο
וְקָנִי	ουαζβου ο	וְקָנִי	ουιχαρδου ο
וְקָנִי	ουακισ α ο	וְקָנִי	ουιφρου ο

c) Before a consonantal ι:

וְקָנִי	ουιεθ θεν ο	וְקָנִי	ουιερογου ο
וְקָנִי	ουιεγα ρ ο	וְקָנִי	ουιαρουμ ο
וְקָנִי	ουιεδαββερ ο	וְקָנִי	ουιαβω ο

§79: *Transliterated as ou plus helping vowel:*

- א) ותאזניני ouεθαζερηני O β) ודעו ouαδου O
 ונרחיבו ouειριβου O ותקמאס ouαυθεμαs O
 טת ouαυετ O

THE NOUN

(Derived Forms are given in Parentheses)

X. MONOSYLLABIC BICONSONANTAL NOUNS

§80: *The a-class (a, a):*

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) בר bar | רב ραβ A (ραβιμ O) |
| בת bath | רם ραμ G |
| גב gab | שי σαι A |
| גל gal (γαλειμ B) | שר σαρ A (sarim, sare) |
| דג dag (dagim) | 2) אב αβ G (αβει B) |
| דם (δαμ O; dame) | אח αχ G (αχει B) |
| יד (ιαδαχ, ιαδω,
ιαδαι O) | הד ad |
| ים iam (ιαμιμ O) | הר αρ A (αριμ O) |
| פז φas B | עז as B |
| פר phar (pharim) | עם αμ O (αμει B,
αμιμ O) |
| צל σal G | עש as |
| צר σαρ O (σαρανι O) | רע ρa O (raim) |

a) feminine forms:

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1) במה βαμα G (βαμωθ G) | 2) אב (abotham) |
| פרה φαρα B | דעה (daath) |
| צרה (σαρωθ O) | מאה (maath) |
| רמה ραμα G (ραμαθ A;
ramathaim;
ραμωθ G) | פחה (φααθ A) |
| | רעה (raath; ρααθι O) |
| | חמה (αμαθι A) |

b) With geminated 2nd radical:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1) בר bad (baddim,
baddau) | רב ραβ A (ραββιμ ο) |
| גל gal (γαλλειμ A) | 2) רח (αφρω ο) |
| גן γαν A (γαννιμ A) | חג (αγγει B) |
| | עג αμ ο (ammi;
αμμαχ, αμμιμ ο) |

c) feminine forms:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1) רבה ραββα A (rabbath,
rabbath) | 2) אמה αμμα G |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|

§81: The *i*-class (ε, η, e):

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) בל bel | צל σελ G (sela) |
| בן βεν A | שם σην A (σεμαχ,
σεμω ο) |
| בת beth | חל θελ G |
| גב (gebim) | 2) חל ηλ G (ηλει B) |
| גר γηρ G | םם εμ ο |
| גח γεθ G | שם ες ο |
| הן hen | ךך (echcha) |
| יד יעד ο | ךך ηδ ο |
| לל (λησιμ ο) | ךך ηρ A |
| נכים (νηχιμ ο) | ךך ρε G (reim) |
| נר νηρ G | חח (them) |
| סφ seph | |

a) feminine forms:

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1) שם (semoth;
σεμωθαμ ο) | 2) דעה dea
חמה (εμαθαχ ο) |
| עצ (ησαθ ο) | |

b) With geminated 2nd radical:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1) לב λεβ ο (λεββι,
λεββαν ο) | רש ρεκ ο (σεκκι ο) |
| צל σελ G (σελλα A) | 2) שח ις A (issi) |
| | ךך (eddim) |

c) feminine form:

זמה ζεμμα B

d) Reduplicated form:

גלגל γελγελ G

צלצל selsel

§82: *The o-class (o, ω, ο):*

- | | | | | |
|----|----|-------|-------|---------------|
| 1) | גב | gob | רב | ροβ ο |
| | דק | doc | שד | sod |
| | כר | χop G | 2) אח | oiim) |
| | | | עו | οξ ο (οξει ο) |

a) feminine form:

אב (ωβωθ G)

b) With geminated 2nd radical:

כל χωλ A (chollo)

c) feminine forms:

חפה χοφφα B

סכה σοχχα ο

d) Reduplicated forms:

בקבוק bocboc

כדכד chodchod

§83: *Nouns with varying vocalization:*

1) change of *a* and *ε* (cf. B.-L. §14 z):

בθ	bath—beth	צל	σαλ G—σελ G
יד	(ιαδαχ ο)—ιδ ο	חמה	(αμαθι A)— (εμαθαχ ο)

2) change of *a* and *ο*:

גב gab—gob

XI. MONOSYLLABIC TRICONSONANTAL NOUNS

§84: *The a-class (a, a):*

1) גבר	γαβρ ο (γαβρι G)	קרן	(καρναιν A)
דרך	(δαρχαμ ο)	קשת	κασθ ο
זבר	(ζαβδעי G)	שבת	σαβτ ο
זמר	(ζαμβρει B)	שמש	σαμs ο
כרם	χαρμ ο (χαρμει, 2) ארץ	ארץ	αρs ο
	χαρμειμ B)	חפץ	(αψει B)
מלך	(malchi; μαλχη ο)	חצר	ασρ B
פרד	φαρδ ο	עבר	αβδ G (αβδעי B;
קרב	(καρβαμ ο)		αβδαχ, αβδω ο)
	ערב	αρβ ο	

a) feminine forms:

חרפה	αρφα ο (αρφавθ ο)	עגלה	αγλα A
	עלמה	alma	

b) With weak 2nd radical:

בער	βαρ ο	מעט	ματ ο
יער	יאר A (יארειμ B)	פעל	(phalach)
כעס	χας ο	שאר	sar
לעג	(לאגה ο)	שחק	σак ο
	חחש	thas	

c) feminine forms:

בהלה	bala	בעלה	(βαλωθ A)
	נהר	(ναρωθ ο)	

§85: *The i-class:*

A. WITH THE VOWEL ε OR η:

1) בקר	βεκρ ο	זבד	(zebdi)
דרך	δερχ ο (δερחי, זכר	זכר	ζεχρ ο (ζεχρει B)
	δερχω ο)	יצר	(ιερρι A; ιεσρο ο)

יתר (iethro)	רגל (ρεγλαι o; reglau)
כסל χεσλ o	רסן ρεσν o
לתך λεθχ o	רשת ρεσθ o
מלך (μελχει b; melche- chem; μελχαμ A)	שטף σετφ o
נגד νεγδ o (νεγδι o)	שמש (semsi)
נזר (νεζρω o)	שקר σεκρ o
נפש (νεφσι, νεφσω, νεφσινου o)	2) אבל εβλ o
סתר σεθρ o (σεθρει A)	חסד εσδ A (εσδι, εσδω, εσδαχ o)
צדק (σεδקי, σεδκαχ o)	חפץ (ephsi)
קרב (κερβα o)	חשך (esci)
קשת κεσθ o	עזר εζρ o (εζρι A; εζρα o)

שמע (σεμει A)

a) feminine forms:

1) חלקה (χελκαθ A)	עברה (ebrath)
צדקה (σεδκαθαχ o)	עזרה (εζραθι o)
רצפה ρεσφα G	עגלה egla
2) דמעה δεμα o	עקב (εκβωθ o)

שמחה σεμα o

b) With weak 2nd radical:

איל el (elim, ele, elau)	כאב cheb
באר βηρ G	נער νερ o
זאב ζηβ G	רחם ρεμ o
זעיר zer	חחת θεθ o

c) feminine forms:

באר (βηρωθ G)	בהמה (βημωθ o)
---------------	----------------

B. WITH THE VOWEL ι:

With weak 2nd radical:

זיז ziz	סיג sig (sigim)
חיץ his	סיס sis

עיר *ειρ* oקיר *cir*ציר *sir*שיר *σιρ* o (*σιρι* o)שעיר (*sirim*)

a) feminine form:

קינה *κινα* A§86: *The o-class:*

A. WITH THE VOWEL o OR ω:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1) בקר <i>βοκρ</i> o | חדש (<i>odsi</i>) |
| גלם (<i>γολμη</i> o) | חלד <i>ολδ</i> o |
| כפר (<i>χοφρω</i> o) | חמר <i>ομρ</i> o |
| קדש <i>κοδς</i> o (<i>κοδσω</i> o;
codsa) | חפץ (<i>οφσι</i> A) |
| קרב <i>κορβ</i> o | חשך (<i>οσχι</i> o) |
| 2) און (<i>οζνι, οζναχ</i> o) | ערף <i>ορφ</i> o |
| | עשר (<i>οσραμ</i> o) |

a) With weak 2nd radical:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| און <i>ων</i> G (<i>oni</i> ; <i>ωνω</i> , G;
<i>ωναμ, ωναν</i> A) | מאד <i>μωδ</i> o |
| אור <i>or</i> | מות <i>μωθ</i> B |
| בור <i>βωρ</i> o | סוד <i>σωδ</i> A (<i>sodi</i>) |
| דוד (<i>dodi, dodach</i>) | צאן <i>σων</i> o |
| דור <i>δωρ</i> G | צום <i>σωμ</i> o |
| הוד <i>ωδ</i> A | צור <i>σωρ</i> o (<i>sori</i>) |
| זהר <i>zor</i> | קול <i>κωλ</i> A (<i>κωλω</i> o) |
| טוב <i>τωβ</i> G (<i>tobim</i>) | קץ <i>κως</i> G |
| יאר <i>ior</i> | ראש <i>ρως</i> G |
| יום <i>iom</i> | רחב <i>rob</i> |
| | שאל <i>σωλ</i> o |

שוט *sot*

b) feminine forms:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| אור (<i>oroth</i>) | חומה <i>homa</i> |
| בושה <i>βωσα</i> o | יונה <i>ιωνα</i> G |
| חובה <i>choba</i> | מוטה <i>mota</i> |

פוחה *photha*

B. WITH THE VOWEL *ou*:

With weak 2nd radical:

אור	<i>oup</i> G (<i>oupei</i> B)	סוס	<i>sus</i> (<i>σουσει</i> B)
באש	(<i>busim</i>)	צוף	<i>σουφ</i> G
בוץ	<i>bus</i>	צור	<i>σουρ</i> G (<i>σουρει</i> B; <i>σουραμ</i> O)
טוב	(<i>τουβαχ</i> O)	ראש	<i>rus</i>
נאם	<i>נומ</i> O	שור	(<i>surim</i>)
סוד	(<i>σουδει</i> B)		
	שור <i>σουρ</i> G		

a) feminine forms:

טור	(<i>turoth</i>)	פארה	<i>phura</i>
סופה	<i>supha</i>	פורה	<i>phura</i>

§87: *Monosyllabic Nouns with affixed helping vowel:*

בטן	<i>βατνε</i> A	כרם	<i>χαρμα</i> B
בשח	<i>βοσθε</i> β	מחנ	<i>μεθγε</i> O

§88: *Nouns with varying vocalization:*1) change of *a* and *ε*:

דרך	(<i>δαρχαμ</i> O)— <i>δερχ</i> O	קרב	(<i>καρβαμ</i> O)— (<i>κερβα</i> O)
זבד	(<i>ζαβδει</i> G)—(<i>zebdi</i>)	קשת	<i>κασθ</i> O—(<i>κεσθ</i> O)
חפץ	(<i>αψει</i> B)—(<i>ephsi</i>)	שמש	<i>σαμς</i> O—(<i>semsi</i>)
מלך	(<i>malchi</i>)— (<i>μελχει</i> B)	עגלה	<i>αγλα</i> A—(<i>egla</i>)

2) change of *a* and *o*:

חפץ	(<i>αψει</i> B)—(<i>οφσι</i> A)	קרב	(<i>καρβαμ</i> O)— <i>κορβ</i> O
-----	-----------------------------------	-----	--------------------------------------

With weak 2nd radical:

3) change of *o* and *ov* (cf. paragraph XXIII sub. 1):

סוד (sodi)—(σουδι A) צור *σωρ* O—*σουρ* G
 ראש *ρως* G—rus

XII. TRICONSONANTAL NOUNS, WHICH APPEAR AS MONOSYLLABIC OR BISYLLABIC FORMS

§89: *Insertion of e as second vowel:*

1) Nouns of the a-class:

גבר *γαβρ* O—*γαβερ* G עבר *αβδ* G—*αβεδ* A
 חצר *ασρ* B—aser שמש *σας* O—*σαςες* A

2) Nouns of the i-class:

חפץ (ephsi)—(ephesi) עיר *εζρ* O—*εζερ* G
 לתך *λεθχ* O—lethech קשת *κεσθ* O—ceseth
 רסן *ρεσν* O—resen

3) Nouns of the o-class:

בשת *βοσθε* B—boseth חמר *ομρ* O—homer
 חלד *ολδ* O—holed קדש *κοδς* O—codes

§90: *Reiteration of the vowel:*

Nouns with weak 2nd radical

1) Nouns of the a-class

בער *βαρ* O—*βααρ* O יער *ιαρ* A—*ιααρ* B
 נהר (ναρωθ O)—*νααρ* O

a) feminine form:

בעלה (*βαλωθ* A)—(baaloth)

2) Nouns of the i-class:

באר $\beta\eta\rho$ G— $\beta\epsilon\eta\rho$ B רחם $\rho\epsilon\mu$ O—rehem

תחת $\vartheta\epsilon\vartheta$ O—theeth

a) feminine form:

בהמה ($\beta\eta\mu\omega\vartheta$ O)—(beemoth)

3) Nouns of the o-class

אהל ($\omicron\lambda\iota$ A)—($\omicron\omicron\lambda\iota$ B)

XIII. BISYLLABIC TRICONSONANTAL NOUNS

1. WITH THE CHARACTERISTIC VOWEL IN
THE SECOND SYLLABLE (cf. paragraph XXVI b)

A. THE A-CLASS:

§91: *With α in the first syllable:*

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) ברד $\beta\alpha\rho\alpha\delta$ A | נבר $\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\rho$ O |
| ברק $\beta\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa$ B | סבך $sabac$ |
| בשר $basar$ (basari) | פגור ($phagarim$) |
| גמל ($\gamma\alpha\mu\alpha\lambda\iota$ A) | פרץ ($\varphi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\mu$ A) |
| דבר $\delta\alpha\beta\alpha\rho$ G (dabarach) | קטן $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$ G |
| ישן $\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ G | שטן $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$ G |
| כזב $chasab$ | שכר $\sigma\alpha\chi\alpha\rho$ A |
| ככר $chachar$ | שפן $\sigma\alpha\varphi\alpha\nu$ G |
| כסמים ($chasamim$) | שרף $\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varphi$ A |
| לבן $\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\nu$ A | חמר $\vartheta\alpha\mu\alpha\rho$ G |
| משל $\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha\lambda$ A | (thamarim) |
| נבל $\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda$ G | 2) אבן ($abanim$) |

אדם	αδαμ A	חצר	ασαρ A
אדם	(adamim)	עבר	(αβαρειμ G)
אטד	αταδ G	ענן	anacim
אמץ	(amasim)	עפר	αφαρ O (afara)
ארז	araz	ערב	arab
הבל	(abal, abalim)	עשן	ασαν A
המסים	(amasim)	3) זרח	ζαρα G (ζαραει B)
חנב	αγαβ G	פרא	phara
חכם	(αχαμιμ O)	רפאים	(raphaim)
חלק	αλακ A	שלח	σαλα A

a) feminine forms:

1) לבנה	λαβανα G	חכמה	(αχαμωθ O)
מקל	(macaloth)	חרדה	arada
נבלה	nabala	ענלה	(αγαλωθ O)
נדבה	(nadaboth)	עזרה	azara
נקמה	(νακαμωθ O)	עטרה	αταρα B
נשמה	nasama (nasamoth)		(αταρωθ G)
צדקה	sadaca	עלמה	(alamoth)
שלמה	σαλαμα G	עצרה	asara
2) אדמה	αδαμα G	ערבה	αραβα G
	(αδαμωθ O)		(αραβωθ G)
אילה	aiala (αιαλωθ O)	3) גבעה	γαβαα G (γαβααθ A; γαβαωθ B)
אנקה	ανακα O	לביא	(labaoth)
אשמה	(asamath)	צבאות	(σαβαωθ G)
חדשה	αδασα A		

b) With weak 2nd radical:

אחד	aad	יחד	ιααδ O
בעל	βααλ G (baali; βααλειμ G)	יער	ιααρ B
בער	βααρ O	להב	(laabim)
דעת	daath	נהר	νααρ O
זהב	zaab	נחש	ναας G
		נחת	naath

פחד	πααδ G	שחר	σααρ A
צעד	(σααδαι O)	שחת	σααθ O
קהל	κααλ O	שער	(σααρειμ O)

תחת θααθ G

c) feminine forms:

בעלה	βααλα A (baaloth)	נחמה	(naamathi)
		צעקה	saaca

d) With geminated 2nd radical:

חגא	agga	חטא	(ατταειμ O)
		כשף	(cassaphe)

§92: *With ε in the first syllable:*

1) ככר	κεχαρ B	שלמים	(selamim)
כנף	chenaph	שמנים	(semanim)
נכר	νηχαρ O	שרף	seraph (seraphim)
קסת	cesath	2) אנך	enach
		ענק	ενακ A (ενακειμ G)

a) feminine forms:

אלם	(elamoth)	אמרה	(εμαραθ O)
		שגגה	segaga

b) Tertiae π and γ:

גוע	geza	פשע	φεσα O (φεσαμ O)
זבח	zeba	צמח	sema
זרע	zera	רשע	ρεσα O

§93: *With α and ε respectively in the first syllable:*

זרע	zara—zera	ככר	chachar—κεχαρ B
		שרף	saraph—seraph

B. THE I-CLASS:

1) With the vowel *ε*:§94: *With a in the first syllable:*

1) זכר	γαβερ G	אבן	aβεν G
נדד	γαδερ A	און	aven
זר	γαζερ G	אחר	aερ B (αηριμ O)
זכר	ζαβεδ G	אצל	asel
חבר	χαβερ B	הבל	aβελ A
טבח	tabech	הרס	ares
יחד	jathed	חצר	aסער A
מסע	masec	חרב	areb
נקב	νακεβ A	חרס	aρes G
ככך	σαβεκ A	חרש	ares
פלנ	φαλεκ A	עבד	aβεδ A
פרץ	φαρες A	עדר	ader
פרש	phares	עצבים	(ασεβειν O)
קדש	καδης A	ערש	ares
	(καδησειμ B)	3) בקע	bace
שבר	σαβερ B	זרח	zare
שכן	(σαχηναυ O)	ירח	ιαρη O
שמש	σαμες A	קצה	κασε O
2) אבל	aβελ G	שלח	sale

a) feminine forms:

1) נדה	γαδηρα G	קדשה	cadosa (cadesoth)
	(γαδηρωθ A)	שדמה	(σαδημωθ A)
נזרה	gazera	2) אטם	(atemoth)
פליטה	phaleta	חצר	(ασηρωθ G)
	מלא	malea	

§95: *With ε in the first syllable:*

1) ביק	βεζεκ B	גזם	gezem
בטן	beten	גסם	gesem
גבר	geber	דבר	deber

הרם	heres	שבר	σεβερ A
זמר	(zemer)	שכם	σεχεμ A
חלום	helem	שמש	semes
חלק	χελεκ A' (χελεκι A)	שקד	seced
חרם	herem	שקל	secel
יצר	ιεσερ B (ιεσερει B)	תבל	thebel
יתר	ιεθερ O	2) אבל	εβελ B
לתך	lethech	אמת	ημεθ O (εμεθθαχ O)
מלך	μελεχ B	אפר	εφηρ O
משק	mesec	חפץ	(ephesi)
נבל	nebel	חדל	edel
נגב	negeb	חלד	eled
נום	nezem	עבר	εβερ A
נמר	nemer	עדן	εδεν A
נצר	neser	עדר	εδερ A
נשף	neseph	עזר	εζερ G
פרץ	pheres	עמק	εμεκ A
פרק	pherec	עקב	eceb
צדק	σεδεκ A	3) בטח	bete
קדם	cedem	בצע	βεσε O
קרב	cereb	זבח	ζεβεε G
קשת	ceseth	יוע	jeze
רמש	remes	מלח	μελε B
רסן	resen	פלא	phele
רשף	reseph		

שמע (σεμεει B)

a) feminine forms:

לבנה	lebena	נשפה	nesepha
------	--------	------	---------

b) With weak 2nd radical:

באר	βεηρ B (beeri)	נעם	νεεμ G
בעל	βεελ G	רהב	reeb
לחם	λεεμ G (λεεμει A)	רחם	rehem
נחל	nehel	רעם	reem

c) feminine forms:

בהמה	(beemoth)	נחלה	nehela (νεελαθαχ ο)
------	-----------	------	------------------------

§96: With α and ε respectively in the first syllable:

גבר	γαβερ G—geber	עדר	ader—εδερ A
הרס	ares—heres	פרץ	φαρες A—pheres
משק	masec—mesec	שבר	σαβερ B—σεβερ A
שמש	σames A—semes		

2) With the vowel ι:

§97: With α in the first syllable:

1) דביר	δαβειρ G	שריד	σαριδ A (saridim)
חסיל	hasil	תמיד	θαμιδ ο
יבש	ιαβεις G	תמים	θαμιμ ο
ימין	ιαμειν A	2) אביב	abib
כסיל	chasil	אמיר	amir
כפס	chaphis	אסיר	ασειρ B
כפיר	chapir	אשיש	(asise)
נפילים	(naphilim)	חזין	(azizim)
נציב	νασειβ B	חסיד	ασιδ ο (ασιδαν ο)
נתינים	(ναθινειμ A)	חריף	αρειφ B
סריס	σαρεις A	עליל	αλιλ ο
פריץ	pharis	עמית	(amithi)
צניף	saniph	עשיר	ασιρ ο
קדים	cadim	3) בריח	bari
קצין	κασιν A	נשיא	nasi
רכיל	rachil	4) יחיד	jaid
שליש	salis	ליש	λαεις B
שמיר	σამειρ B	מעיל	mail

a) feminine forms:

גלילה	galila (γαλιλωθ A)	קריה	caria (καριαθ G; καριαθαμ A; καριωθ A)
חסידה	asida		
לפידות	(λαφειδωθ B)		

§98: *With ε in the first syllable:*

- | | | | |
|---------|-----------|--------|--------|
| 1) ברית | βεριθ B | רחיק | rethic |
| נסיך | (nesiche) | 2) בכי | βεχι O |
| נציב | νεσιβ A | חצי | εσει A |
| | | פרי | pheri |

a) feminine form:

גבירה gebira

§99: *With α and ε respectively in the first syllable:*

נציב νασειβ B—νεσειβ A

C. THE O-CLASS:

1) With the vowel o:

§100: *With α in the first syllable:*

- | | | | |
|---------|------------------------|---------|---------------------------|
| 1) גדול | gadol | ששון | σασων O |
| חזון | hazon | 2) ארון | (αδωνει B;
αδωναι O) |
| כבוד | χαβωδ O | המון | αμων G (amona,
amonim) |
| נכון | ναχων A | עגור | agor |
| ציון | saion | ערום | arom |
| צפון | σαφων B
(σαφωνει B) | עשור | ασωρ O |
| רזון | ραζων A | 3) גאון | (gaon) |
| רצון | ρασων O | שאון | σασων G |
| שלום | σαλωμ G | | |

§101: *With ε in the first syllable:*

- | | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| 1) בכור | bechor | אפוד | ephod |
| דרור | deror | חמור | emor |
| כפור | χεφορ O | 3) אלוה | ελω O |
| 2) אנוש | ενωσ A | מלוא | μελω A |

a) feminine forms:

בכורה (βεχωραθ A) לבונה λεβωνα G

b) With geminated 2nd radical:

חמור εμμωρ G מלוא mello
כנור χεννωρ O רמון ρεμμων G

c) feminine forms:

בכורה bechchora דבורה δεββωρα G

2) With the vowel ou:

§102: With a in the first syllable:

1) זנונים (zanunim)	עגור agur
כרוב χαρουβ B	עלומים (αλουμαν O)
רכוש rachus	עמור (αμουδα O)
2) אנוש anus	3) תפוח θαφου B
אשור (ασουρηνου O)	4) בחור (βαουρειμ G)
המון amun	רחום ραουμ A

a) feminine form:

ישועה (ιασουαθι O)

§103: With ε in the first syllable:

אמון (εμουνημ O)	זבול ζεβουλ G
גבול gebul (gebulaic)	כלוב chelub
גדוד γεδουδ O	כרוב χερουβ A
גלולים (gelule)	(χερουβειμ G)
זבוב zebub	לבוש (λεβουσι O)

שקוץ (secuse)

a) feminine forms:

אמונה	emuna (εμουνναδαχ	גבורה	(geburoth;
	o; emunatho)		γεβουροθau o)
בתולה	bethula	ירושה	ιρουσα A
	ישועה	jesua	

§104: *With α and ε respectively in the first syllable:*

כרוב χαρουβ B—χερουβ A

2: WITH THE CHARACTERISTIC VOWEL IN
THE FIRST SYLLABLE:

D. THE A-CLASS:

§105: *With α and ε respectively in the second syllable:*

חצר	ασαp A—ασεp A	פרץ	(pharasin)—
סבך	sabac—σαβεk A		φαpes A

E. THE O-CLASS:

§106: *With α in the second syllable:*

1) חותם	χωδαμ A	2) אצר	ωσαp B
כמר	(χωμαρειμ G)	עולם	ωλαμ O
שופר	sophar	3) מוטה	mota
		מוצא	μωσα O

§107: *With ε in the second syllable:*

1) בשת	boseth	סכן	socen
חדש	hodes	קדש	codes
חלד	holed	שחל	sohel
חמר	homer	חפה	thophet
חרש	hores	2) ארך	ορεχ A
		חנף	oneph

a) feminine form:

עונה onena

§108: *With o in the second syllable:*

Nouns with weak 2nd radical:

אהל	οολ A (οολι B)	צח	soor
זהב	ξοοβ A	רעות	rooth
		שחל	sohol

a) feminine forms:

גאלה	(goolathach)	רחוב	(rooboth)
------	--------------	------	-----------

3. NOUNS WITH VARYING VOCALIZATION:

§109: *Change of o and ou (cf. paragraph XXIII sub 1):*

המן	αμυν G—amun	כמר	(χωμαρειμ G)—(chumarim)
		עגור	agor—agur

§110: *nomina tertiae* ח:

זבח	ζεβεε G—zeba	זרח	zare—zara
-----	--------------	-----	-----------

XIV. NOUNS WITH PREFIXED מ

VOCALIZED AS μα (cf. ¶ XXVI c):

§111: *The a-class:*

1) מבצר	μαβσαρ A	2) מאכל	machal
	(μαβσαρاني ο)	מחמד	mamad
מבשם	μαβσαμ A	3) מלקחים	(malcaim)
מגדל	μαγδαλ A	משמע	μασμα A
מגרש	magras	4) מבהר	μαβαρ A
מדבר	μαδβαρ B	מרחב	μαραβ ο
מכתב	machthab	מלאך	malach, (malachi,
מספר	μασφαρ G		malache)

a) feminine forms:

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------|---------|-------------|
| 1) ממלכה | (μαμλαχωθ ο) | | (μαλαμωθ ο) |
| מרכבת | (μαρχαβωθ Α) | מפעל | (μαφαλωθ ο) |
| 2) מחלה | μαλα G | 4) מרמה | μαρμα Α |
| 3) מלחמה | μαλαμα ο | | (μαρμωθ ο) |
| | 5) מנחה | μανα ο | |

§112: *The i-class:*

With the vowel e, η:

מזבח	μασβηη ο	מקנה	macne
מכתש	machthes	מרפא	marphe
ממזר	mamzer	משא	μασση Α

a) feminine form:

מקהלה (μακηλωθ G)

§113: *The o-class:*

1) With the vowel o, ω:

מזמור	μαζμωρ ο	מכאוב	(μαχωβιμ ο)
-------	----------	-------	-------------

a) mediae ι:

מאור	maor	מעוג	μαωγ ο
מרון	μαδων Α	מעוז	μαοζ ο (μαοζι ο)
מחול	μαωλ ο	מעון	μαων Α
מנוח	μανωε G	מצור	μασωρ ο
		מקום	(macoma)

2) With the vowel ου: nomina mediae ι:

מגור	magur	מנוד	μανουδ ο
מחול	μαουλ Α	מנוח	manue
		מצור	masur

a) feminine form:

מבוכה mabucha

XV. THE ARTICLE

THE ARTICLE IS ALWAYS transliterated AS *a* (cf. ¶ XXVI d):§114: *Before a vowel:*

1) האדם	aadam	2) החנב	aagab
האיש	a ϵ is o	החפץ	a α φ η s o
האל	aηλ o	החסים	aωσιμ o
הארץ	a α ps o	3) העיר	a ϵ ip o
		העמק	a ϵ μεκ A

§115: *Before a consonant:*

הגן	agan	הקטן	aκαταν B
הדגים	adagim	הראש	aρωs A
היום	a ι ωμ o	הרדדים	ardidim
הלוחש	aλω η s B	הרשעים	aρσa ϵ ιμ o
הסנאה	aσανουa A	השדמות	asademoth
הצדק	asedec	השמינית	aσεμινι ν o
הקוץ	aκωs B	השפחים	asephathaim

§116: *With gemination of the following consonant:*

הבא	aββα o	המיחלים	aμμηaλιμ o
הבוטח	aββωτη o	המים	aμμaιμ o
הבוטחים	aββωτ ϵ ειμ o	המלך	ammelech
הבית	aββαι ν o	המנחה	aμμaνa o
הגוי	aggoi	הנותן	aννω ν η ν o
הכבוד	aχχαβωδ o	הנתינים	aννα ν ι ν ιμ A
הכמרים	acchumarim	הפרה	affara
הכרובים	accherubim	הקוץ	aκκωs A
הלוחש	aλλω η s A	הקטן	aκκαταν A
הלחות	alluoth	הקריות	aκκαριω ν A
המאזני	aμμαaζ ϵ ρη ν ι o	השחת	aσσaα ν o
	השמרים		aσσωμριμ o

XVI. THE INSEPARABLE PREPOSITIONS בכלם.

A. THE PREPOSITIONS בכל:

§117: Transliterated as βα, χα, λα respectively:

a) Before a consonant:

1) בבן	babēn	בשמות	basemoth
ביה	βαia o	2) כבהמות	χαβημωθ o
בכעס	βαχas o	כנצר	chaneser
בלבבם	βαλβαβαμ o	כצאן	χασων o
בנועים	βανγαιμ o	כשמש	χασαμs o
בנהרות	βαναρωθ o	3) לבקר	λαβεκρ o
בסוד	βασωδ A	לכל	λαχολ o
בסופה	basupha	למלחמה	λαμαλαμα o
בפיהם	βαφιεμ o	למשל	λαμασαλ o
בפתחיה	baphethee'	למשפטי	λαμεσφατι o
בצום	βασωμ o	לגוד	λανεγδ o
בציון	basaion	לצו	lasau
בקרב	bacereb	לקו	lacau
ברוח	barua	לרשע	λαρασα o
ברצונך	βαρσωναχ o	לרשע	λαρεσα o
ברצונו	βαρσωνω o	לשאול	λασωλ o

b) Before the vowel α:

1) באפו	βααφρω o	בערב	βααρβ
בארץ	βααρps o	2) כאח	χaa o
בהדרת	βααδαρεθ o	כעפר	χaaφαρ o
בחנפי	βαανφη o	3) לארץ	λαaaps o
בעליל	βααλιλ o	להררי	λααραרי o
בעם	βααμ o	לעבד	λααβδ o

c) Before the vowel ε:

באמונתך	βαεμουναθαχ o	באש	βαes o
באמונתו	baemunatho	בעזרתו	βαεζραθi o
		לעד	laed

§118: *Transliterated as βε, χε, λε respectively:*

a) Before the vowel ε:

בחיקי	βηηκι ο	בעיד	βειειρ ο
בחסדך	βεεζδαχ ο	כאבל	χεεβλ ο

b) Before a consonant:

בגבורתו	βεγεβουροθau ο	בעברות	βεγαβρωθ ο
	לבני	λεβנה	ο

§119: *Transliterated merely as β, χ, λ respectively:*

a) Before a consonant:

1) בנאותו	βγηουauθ ο	בקרבה	βκερβα ο
בדמי	βδαמי ο	בראשית	βρησιθ ο
בדרך	βδερχ ο	ברב	βροβ ο
ביד	ביעד ο	בשבת	βσαβτ ο
בידך	βιαδαχ ο	בשחק	βσακ ο
ביום	biom	בשלי	βσαλουι ο
בכנור	βχεννωρ ο	בשמותם	βσεμωθαμ ο
בלב	βλεβ ο	בתורת	βθωραθ ο
במשפטי	βμεσφατι ο	2) כידח	χιαρη ο
בסכה	βσοχχα ο	כפדד	χφαρδ ο
בסתר	βσεθρ ο	כצדקך	χσεδκαχ ο
בצדקתך	βσεδκαθαχ ο	כרע	χρηε ο
בצלעי	βσαλη ο	3) לבית	λβηθ ο
בצרות	βסארωθ ο	למחול	λμαωλ ο
בקולו	βκωλω ο	לשטף	λσετφ ο
	לשכניו	λσαχηנau ο	

b) Before a vowel:

1) באלהי	βελwai ο	בעצח	βησαιθ ο
באלהיו	βελoau ο	2) כאילות	χαιαλωθ ο
ביהוה	βαδωνai ο	כימי	χιμη ο
בימי	βιμη ο	3) לאחרים	λαηριμ ο
	לעולם	λωλαμ ο	

§120: *Transliterated as βα, with gemination of the following consonant:*

בגוים	baggoim.	במרחב	βαμμαραβ ο
במלחמה	βαμμαλαμα ο	בפוך	baphphuch

B. THE PREPOSITION מ:

§121: *Transliterated as μ plus helping vowel ε:*

a) Before a consonant:

מבטן	mebeten	מנגד	μενεγδ ο
מיד	μειεδ ο	מקדם	mecedem
מים	mejām	מרחם	μηρεμ ο
מכפירים	μεχφεριμ ο	מרכסי	μερυχשה ο
ממסגרותיהם	μεμασγρωθειμ ο	מרשת	μερεσθ ο

b) Before a vowel:

מאין	μηην ο	מידים	μειδηχημ ο
		מעברים	meabarim

§122: *With gemination of the following consonant:*

מבית	mebbeth	ממשקה	memmasce
מבלעדי	μεββελαδη ο	משאול	μεσσωλ ο
מכנה	mecchenaph	משחר	μεσσσααρ ο
ממצרים	μεμμισραιμ ο	משירי	μεσסירי ο

XVII. NOUNS WITH PERSONAL SUFFIXES

A. THE SINGULAR NOUN

§123: *The suffix of the 1. pers. sing.: ει, ι, η:*

1) אבי	αβει B	אדוני	αδωνει B
אחי	αχει B	חני	αγγει B
אלי	ηλει B	לחמי	λεεμει A
אורי	ουρει B	יצרי	ιεσερει B

2) אהלי	οολι B	לבושי	λεβουσι ο
חשכי	οσχι ο	משפטי	μεσφατι ο
אזני	οζνι ο	לבי	λεββι ο
דרכי	δερχι ο	מגני	μαγεννι ο
יצרי	ιεσρι A	3) אוני	oni
מלכי	μελχι A	חדשי	odsi
נגדי	νεγδι ο	חשקי	esci
כרמי	χαρμι A	בשרי	basari
מעוזי	μαοζι ο	אישי	issi
גמלי	γαμαλι G	4) גלמי	γολμη ο
חלקי	χελεκι A	צלעי	σαλη ο
רוחי ρουη ο			

§124: *The suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc.: αχ*
(cf. ¶ XXIX B 1), χα:

1) אונך	οζναχ ο	נחלתך	νεελαθαχ ο
ארחך	οραχ ο	אמתך	εμεδθαχ ο
דודך	dodach	אמונתך	εμουναθαχ ο
עבדך	αβδαχ ο	גאלתך	goolathach
טובך	τουβαχ ο	משיחך	μεσιαח ο
היכלך	ηχαλαχ ο	2) ישעך	ιεσαχα ο
חמתך	εμαθαχ ο	חכך	echcha

§125: *The suffix of the 3. pers. sing. masc.: ω, ο:*

אוני	ωνω G	כפרו	χοφρω ο
ידו	jado	אפו	αφρω ο
דרכו	δερχω ο	כסאו	χεςσω ο
חסדו	εσδω ο	ימינו	ιμινω ο
יצרו	ιεσρω ο	משיחו	μεσιω ο
יתרו	iethro	מנוחתו	mnuatho
גורו	νεζρω ο	אמונתו	emunatho

§126: *The suffix of the 3. pers. sing. fem.: α:*

עזרה	εζρα ο	מקומה	macoma
קדשה	codsa	עמודה	αμουδα ο
המונה	amona	עפרה	afara

§127: *The suffix of the 1. pers. sing.:*
 ενου, ινου, ηνου:

אשורנו ασουρενου' ο נפשנו νεφσινου ο
 עיננו ηγηνου ο

§128: *The suffix of the 2. pers. plur. masc.:* εχεμ (cf. ¶ XXVI f 2):

לבבכם λεββαβεχεμ ο מלככם melchechem

§129: *The suffix of the 3. pers. plur. masc.:* αμ, εμ:

1) דרכם	δαρχαμ ο	עשרם	οσραμ ο
חילם	αιλαμ G	לבבם	λβαβαμ ο
מלכם	μελχαμ A	אונם	ωναμ A
עינם	enam	פשעם	φεσσαμ ο
		2) פיהם	φιεμ ο

B. THE PLURAL NOUN:

§130: *The suffix of the 1. pers. sing.:* αι:

אדוני	αδωναι ο	צעדי	σααδαι ο
אלהי	ελωναι ο	מצותי	μσωθαι ο
איבי	οιεβαι ο	שפתי	σφωθαι ο
ידי	ιαδαι ο	חזונוי	θανουναι ο

§131: *The suffix of the 2. pers. sing. masc.:* αχ (cf. on §128), cha:

1) איביך	οιβαχ ο	חסריך	εσδαχ ο
אלהיך	ελωαχ ο	עברריך	αβδαχ ο
דברריך	dabarach	עיניך	ηναχ ο
		2) מתריך	methecha

§132: *The suffix of the 2. pers. sing. fem.:* aich:

בניך	benaich	גבולריך	gebulaich
------	---------	---------	-----------

§133: *The suffix of the 3. pers. sing. masc.: αυ, αυι:*

1) איביו	οιβαν ο	עלוי	αλουμαν ο
איליו	elau	שכני	σαχηναν ο
אלהיו	ελοαν ο	גבורתיו	γεβουροθαν ο
בניו	βαναν ο	בדיו	baddau
עיניו	ηναν ο	2) מבצרו	μαβσαρानι ο
מימיו	μημαν ο	צרו	σαרानι ο
חסידיו	ασιδαν ο	עליו	αλανι ο

§134: *The suffix of the 2. pers. plur. masc.: χεμ:*

ידיכם ιδηχεμ ο

§135: *The suffix of the 3. pers. plur. masc.: εμ, αμ, ημω:*

1) אחריהם	αρηεμ ο	2) משכנותם	μισχνωθαμ ο
כסיליהם	chisileem	אבותם	abotham
		3) שנימו	σεννημω ο

XVIII. THE FORMATION OF THE PLURAL

§136: *Masculine forms:*

a) By adding *ειμ, ιμ* to the noun:

אביון	ebion—ebionim	סיג	sig—sigim
איתן	ethan—ethanim	עם	αμ G—αμιμ ο
אחר	αερ B—αηριμ ο	פר	phar—pharim
איל	el—elim	כרם	χαρμ ο—
אל	ηλ G—ηλιμ ο		χαρμειμ B
בעל	βααλ G—	קדש	καδης A—
	βααλειμ G		καδησειμ B
בריה	bari—barihim	רע	ρα ο—raim
גל	gal—γαλειμ B	שועל	σουαλ A—sualim
המון	αμων G—amonim	שטה	setta—settim
הר	αρ ο—αριμ ο	שריד	σαριδ A—saridim
טוב	τωβ G—tobim	שרף	seraph—seraphim
ים	iam—ιαμιμ ο	חמר	θαμαρ G—
כרוב	χερουβ A—χερουβειμ G		thamarim

b) With a change in the vowel:

אין	ηυ ο	בית	βηθ ο
עין	ηυ Α	ניא	ge

§139: *stat. constr. masc. plur.* (cf. ¶ XXVI c):

1) בן	βανη Α	לעג	λαγη ο
דס	dame	מלך	μαλχη ο
פנים	φανη ο	עבר	αβδη Α
שנים	sane	3) ישר	ισρη ο
שר	sare	רגע	ρεγη ο
2) דבר	δαβρη ο	4) גלולים	gelule
הבל	αβλη ο	מלאך	malache
חנף	ανφη ο	נסיד	nesiche
תעלולים thalule			

B. FEMININE FORMS

§140: *stat. constr. fem. sing.*:

a) Monosyllabic nouns:

1) חלקה	χελκαθ Α	רמה	ραμαθ Α
חרפה	αρφαθ ο	תורה	θωραθ ο
עברה	ebrath	2) מאה	maath
עצה	ησαθ ο	פחה	φααθ Α
רבה	rabbath	רעה	raath

b) Bisyllabic nouns:

אמרה	εμαραθ ο	גבעה	γαβααθ Α
אשמה	asamath	קריה	καριαθ G
בכורה	βεχωραθ Α	הדרה	αδαρεθ ο

§141: *stat. constr. fem. plur.*:

ארמון	armanoth	ערבה	αραβωθ G
מפעל	μαφαλωθ ο	שרמה	σαδημωθ Α
משרפת	μασρεφωθ Α	שם	semoth

§142: *Dual-forms:*

מחנה	manaim	קריה	καριαθαιμ A
מלקחים	malcaim.	קרן	καρναιμ A
עין	enaim	רמה	ramathaim
		שפה	asephathaim

A HEBREW DICTIONARY

The subdivisions (a, b, c) indicate that these transliterations are evidence of different pronunciations, as dealt with in the respective paragraphs of the Grammar; for nominal forms cf. the Introduction paragraph XXVIa (classifications of מלך). As a rule, differences in the rendering of Hebrew consonants (cf. Introduction, paragraph XXIII) are hereby *not* considered.

א

- אב $\alpha \beta$ G in Ελιαβ, Ex. 31.6; a b On in Eliab ib.
 אבי $\alpha \beta \epsilon \iota$ B in Αβειηλ, 1 Sam. 9.1;
 $\alpha \beta \iota$ A in Αβιηλ, ib.; o Ps. 89.27;
 a bi J in Abimelech, Gen. 20.2.
 אבותם a b o t h a m J Isa. 14.21.
 אב $\omega \beta \omega \vartheta$ G Num. 21.10.
 אבד $\iota \sigma \beta \alpha \delta \omicron \upsilon$ O Ps. 49.11; cf. BV Prov. 19.9: יאבד
 in Ms. Ec 1 for MT יאבד.
 אביב a bi b J Ezek. 3.15.
 אביון e bi o n J Isa. 25.4.
 וְאֲבִיּוֹן $\omicron \upsilon \epsilon \beta \iota \omega \nu$ O Ps. 49.3.
 אֲבִיּוֹנִים e bi o ni m J Jer. 5.28.
 אביונה a bi o n a J Eccl. 12.5.
 אבל $\alpha \beta \epsilon \lambda$ G 2 Sam. 20.14; a bel On in Abelsattim,
 Num. 33.49.
 אבל a) בְּאֵבֶל $\chi \epsilon \epsilon \beta \lambda$ O Ps. 35.14; MT: בְּאֵבֶל; cf. BV ib. אֵבֶל
 in Ms. Ec 1.
 b) אֵבֶל $\epsilon \beta \epsilon \lambda$ B in Εβελχαρμειν, Ju. 11.33; MT: אֵבֶל.
 אבן a) אֲבָנִים a ba ni m J Jer. 18.3; MT: אֲבָנִים.
 b) אֵבֶן $\alpha \beta \epsilon \nu$ G in Αβενεζερ, 1 Sam. 7.12; a ben J
 Zech. 5.7.
 אברך a b re ch J Gen. 41.43.
 אגמון a g mo n J Isa. 19.15.
 אגן a ga no th J Isa. 22.24.

- אדון אָדוֹנִי *a δ ω ν ε ι* B in *Αδωνειραμ*, 1 Ki. 4.6;
a δ ω ν ι A in *Αδωνιραμ*, ib.; *a d o n i* On in *Adoniram*, ib.
- אָדֹנִי *a δ ω ν α ι* o Ps. 30.9.
- אָדָם *a δ α μ* A Gen. 3.21; o Ps. 31.20; *a d a m* On Gen. 3.21.
 אָדָם *a a d a m* j Isa. 2.22.
- אָדָם *a d a m i m* j Zech. 6.2; cf. s. v. אָמָם.
- אָדָמָה *a δ α μ α* G Deut. 29.23; MT: אָדָמָה; *a d a m a* On ib.
 אָדָמָה *a δ α μ ω θ* o Ps. 49.12.
- אָהַב וְאֶהְבֵּהוּ *ο υ ε α β η ο υ* o Hos. 11.1; MT: וְאֶהְבֵּהוּ; cf. אָהַב
 Prov. 8.17; cf. B-L, §53r, u.
- אָהַב *α β ο υ* o Ps. 31.24.
- אֵל a) אֵלִי *ο λ ι* A in *Ολιβα*, Ezek. 23.4; *oli* On in
Olibama, Gen. 36.2; cf. in BV monosyllabic nominal
 forms like: כֹּאֵלִי Cant. 1.5; בֹּאֵלֶךְ Ps. 91.10;
 בֹּאֵלֶיהֶם Ps. 106.25 (Ms. Ecl).
- b) אֵל *ο ο λ* A 1 Chron. 3.20: OOA lege: OOA.
 אֵלִי *ο ο λ ι* B in *Οολιβα*, Ezek. 23.4; *o oli* On in
Ooliba, ib.
- אֵי *ο i* j Isa. 24.16.
- אֵיבָה a) *ω ι η β* o Ps. 31.9.
 אֵיבָה *ω ι η β η ο* Ps. 35.19: ΩHBH lege: ΩIHBH;
 H-R; *ω ε β η* cf. Thompson Facs. 6 (I—E); MT: אֵיבָה.
 אֵיבָה *ο ι ε β α ι* o Ps. 18.38; *ο ι ε β β α ι* o Ps. 30.2.
- b) אֵיבִיךָ *ο ι β α χ* o Ps. 89.52.
 אֵיבִיךָ *ο ι β α υ* o Ps. 89.43.
- אֵילָם *ο υ λ α μ* G 1 Chron. 7.16; *u l a m* j Ezek. 40.24; MT:
 אֵילָם.
- אֵן *a v e n* j Amos 1.5; *a b e n* On in Bethaben, Hos. 4.15;
 for the interchange of *v* and *b*, cf. Josh. 3.10.
 אֵן Codex B: *ευαιον*, Codex n: *εβαιον* (the
 Hebrew ו rendered as: *v—β*); the reverse cf. ib:
 אֵן Codex B: *ιευουσαιον*, Codex b: *ιευουσαιον*
 (the Hebrew ב rendered as: *β—v*); cf. *The Old
 Testament in Greek*, edited by A. E. Brooke and
 N. McLean, Vol. I, Part IV, Cambridge 1917.
- אֵן a) *α υ ν* B Num. 16.1; *a u n* On Ezek. 30.17; MT: אֵן;
 cf. B-L., §17b'; cf. s. v. מוֹת sub א).

אֹנִי $a\ u\ v\ a\ v$ A Gen. 38.9.

b) אֹנִי $\omega\ v$ G Hos. 4.15; MT: אֹנִי; o n On, ib.; cf. in the PV הָאֹנִי (MdWI, p. 1, line 5), וּמֵאֹנִי (ib., line 6).

אֹנִי o n i On in Benoni, Gen 35.18.

אֹנִי $\omega\ v\ \omega$ G Neh. 7.37.

אֹנִים $\omega\ v\ a\ \mu$ A 1 Chron. 1.40.

אֹנִי $\omega\ v\ a\ v$ B 1 Chron. 1.40; MT: אֹנִים; o n a n On Gen. 38.9.

אֹר or J Isa. 31.9.

אֹרֶת o r o t h J Isa. 26.19.

אֹר $\sigma\ \rho\ \sigma$ G in $\text{C}\epsilon\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\kappa$, Num. 1.5; u r J Isa. 31.9.

אֹרִי $\sigma\ \rho\ \sigma\ \epsilon\iota$ B 1 Chron. 2.20; $\sigma\ \rho\ \iota$ A, ib.

אֹר $\iota\ a\ \epsilon\iota\ \rho$ G Deut. 3.14; i a i r On Num. 32.41.

אֹרֶת $\vartheta\ a\ \epsilon\iota\ \rho$ o Ps. 18.29.

אֹנִי $\sigma\ \zeta\ \iota$ o Ps. 49.5; o z n i On Num. 26.16.

אֹנֶה $\sigma\ \zeta\ v\ a\ \chi$ o Ps. 31.3.

אֹנִי e e z i n u J Joel 1.2.

אֹרֶת וּמֵאֹרֶת $\sigma\ \epsilon\ \vartheta\ \epsilon\ \zeta\ \sigma\ \rho\ \eta\ v\ \iota$ o Ps. 18.40; MT: וּמֵאֹרֶתִי.

אֹרֶת $\sigma\ \epsilon\ \vartheta\ a\ \zeta\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \eta\ v\ \iota$ o Ps. 30.12; without gemination of the 2nd radical; cf. on אֶכְזֹב.

אֹרֶת $\alpha\ \mu\ \mu\ a\ a\ \zeta\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \eta\ v\ \iota$ o Ps. 18.33; MT: הִקְמָא.

אֶחָ a χ G in $\text{A}\chi a\alpha\beta$, 2 Ki. 1.1.

אֶחָ $a\ \chi\ \epsilon\iota$ B in $\text{A}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu a\alpha\nu$, 1 Sam. 25.43; $a\ \chi\ \iota$ A in $\text{A}\chi\iota\nu a\alpha\mu$, ib.; a c h i On in Achisamech, Ex. 31.6.

b) אֶחָ o Ps. 49.8; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.

אֶחָ $\chi\ a\ a$ o Ps. 35.14.

אֶחָ a h i On in Ahihod, Num. 34.27; for the insertion of the h between a and i, cf. paragraph X.

אֶחָ o i i m J Isa. 13.21; p. 245c; o h i m J ib., p. 174E; for the insertion of h between o and i, cf. paragraph X.

אֶדָ a a d J Gen. 48.22.

אֶדָ a h u J Gen. 41.2; cf. paragraph X, and paragraph XXIII sub ח.

אֶדָ $a\ \chi\ a\ s$ B in $\text{I}\omega a\chi a s$, 2 Ki. 10.35; cf. paragraph XXIII sub י and ח.

$a\ \chi\ a\ \zeta$ A in $\text{I}\omega a\chi a\zeta$, ib.; a c h a z On Mic. 1.1.

$a\ a\ \zeta$ A in $\text{A}a\zeta\iota a$, 2 Ki. 14.13; a a z On 2 Ki. 15.38.

- אָהר *a e ρ* B 1 Chron. 7.12; *aher* J Isa. 42.8; cf. paragraph X and XXIII sub ח.
- לְאֶחְרִים *l a η ρ ι μ ο* Ps. 49.11; for the change of *ε* in the singular to *η* in the plural, see our remarks in paragraph XXVIa.
- אֲחֵרִי *o s u a a ρ η ε μ ο* Ps. 49.14: ΟΥΔΑΡΗΕΜ, lege A pro Δ; cf. Thompson Facs. 4 and 5.
- אָחַח *a a θ* ο Ps. 89.36.
- אָטָד *a τ α δ* G Gen. 50.10; *a t a d* On, ib.
- אֶטֶם *a t e m o t h* J Ezek. 40.16; MT: אֶטְמוֹת.
- אִי *i i m* J Isa. 13.22.
- אֵיה *a ι η* ο Ps. 89.50.
- אֵיל *e l* J Ezek. 40.14.
- אֵלִים *e l i m* J Ezek. 40.14.
- אֵלֵי *e l e* J Isa. 61.3.
- אֵלָו *e l a u* J Ezek. 40.21.
- אֵילָה *a i a l a* J Gen. 49.21.
- בְּאֵילֹת *χ α ι α λ ω θ* ο Ps. 18.34.
- אֵין *η ν* ο Ps. 32.9.
- וְאֵין *o s η ν* ο Ps. 18.42.
- פְּאֵין *μ η η ν* ο Mal. 2.13.
- אֵיפָה *e p h a* J Isa. 5.10.
- אֵישׁ *ε ι s* B in Ειστωβ, 2 Sam. 10.6; ο Ps. 31.21; *e i s* J Gen. 32.29.
- ι s* A in Ιστοβ, 2 Sam. 10.6; ο Ps. 92.7; *i s* J Jer. 1.11.
- h i s* On in Histob, 2 Sam. 10.6.
- הָאֵישׁ *a ε ι s* ο Ps. 1.1.
- אִישִׁי *i s s i* J Hos. 2.18; cf. in the BV אִשִּׁי 2 Sam. 14.5 in Ms. 105 JThS; the omission of the *י* after *א* necessitates a gemination of the *ש* according to the rules of the Tiberian Grammar.
- אֵתָן a) *a ι θ α ν* G 1 Chron. 15.17; cf. s. v. בֵּית and חֵיל sub a).
b) *e t h a n* J Jer. 5.15.
- אֶתָנִים *e t h a n i m* J Mic. 6.2.
- אָךְ *a c h* J Jer. 32.30.
- אָכַן *a χ η ν* ο Ps. 31.23.
- אֵל *ε λ* ο Gen. 49.4; Ps. 31.2; cf. in the BV אֵל 2 Sam. 1.21 in Ms. 105 JThS.

- בִּלְ a) a l j in alechcha: אֶלְחָחָ Hos. 8.1; cf. in the BV
 בִּלְ 2 Sam. 14.8 in Ms. 105 JThS.
 ב) ε λ ο Mal. 2.13.
 בִּלְ ou ε λ ο Ps. 30.9.
 בִּלְ η λ α ι ο Gen. 43.23; e l a i j Isa. 21.11.
 ι λ ε ι ο Ps. 31.3; cf. in the BV בִּלְ 2 Sam. 3.8 in Ms.
 105 JThS.
 בִּלְ η λ α χ ο Ps. 30.9.
 בִּלְ η λ α υ ο Ps. 32.6.
 בִּלְ η λ G in Αβειηλ, 1 Sam. 9.1; ο Ps. 29.3; ε λ G in
 Ελκανα, Ex. 6.24; e l j Isa. 9.15.
 בִּלְ a η λ ο Ps. 18.31.
 בִּלְ η λ ε ι B in Μελληηλει, Num. 26.45; η λ ι ο Ps.
 89.27; ε λ ι G in Ελιαβ, Num. 1.9; e l i On in
 Eliezer, Ex. 18.4.
 בִּלְ η λ ι μ ο Ps. 29.1.
 בִּלְ ε λ ω ε ι μ ο Ps. 36.2; e l o i m j Gen. 6.2.
 בִּלְ μ η ε λ ω ε ι μ ο Ps. 8.6.
 בִּלְ ε λ ω η ο Ps. 18.47; ε λ ω ε ι ο Ps. 72.15; ε λ ω ι
 ο Ps. 47.10; to the Hebrew ending in ם, rendered
 by η, ει and ι respectively, cf. paragraph XXIII
 sub ι.
 בִּלְ ε λ ω α ι ο Ps. 18.29.
 בִּלְ ou β ε λ ω α ι ο Ps. 18.30.
 בִּלְ ε λ ω α χ ο Ps. 45.8; e l o a c h j Amos 4.12:
 ELOAH is a misprint for: ELOACH.
 בִּלְ β ε λ ο α υ ο Isa. 8.21; MT: בִּלְ.
 בִּלְ ε λ ω η ν ο υ ο Ps. 18.32: ΕΛΩΝΝΟΤ lege
 ΕΛΩΗΝΟΤ; cf. Thompson Facs. 5 (N—H).
 בִּלְ ε λ ο Ps. 18.32; cf. in the BV בִּלְ Job 3.23; in Ms.
 Ec 1.
 בִּלְ e l l a j Jer. 2.34.
 בִּלְ e l a On Gen. 36.41.
 בִּלְ e l a m o t h j Ezek. 40.16.
 בִּלְ ε μ ο Ps. 35.14.
 בִּלְ ε μ ο Ps. 89.31.
 בִּלְ α μ μ α G 2 Sam. 2.24 (B: AMMAN is a scribe's mis-
 take); a m m a On ib.

- אָמוֹן a) *εμουσνιμ ο* Ps. 31.24.
 b) *εμμουσνειμ ο* Isa. 26.2; *emmunim j ib.*
- אָמוֹנָה *emuna j* Jer. 5.3.
- בְּאִמוֹנָתִי β' *αεμουσναθι ο* Ps. 89.34: ΒΑΜΟΤΝΑΘΙ
 lege ΒΑΕΜΟΤΝΑΘΙ.
- בְּאִמוֹנָתְךָ β' *αεμουσναθαχ ο* Ps. 89.50.
- בְּאִמוֹנָתוֹ *baemunatho j* Hab. 2.4.
- אִמִּיר *amir j* Isa. 17.9.
- אָמֵן *αμην ο* Ps. 89.53; *amen j* Isa. 65.16.
- וְאָמֵן *ουαμην ο* Ps. 89.53.
- אָמֵן נְאֻמֵּן *νεεμαν ο* Ps. 89.38.
- נְאֻמָּנָה *νεεμαναθ ο* Ps. 89.29.
- נְאֻמָּנִים *neemanim j* Isa. 17.11.
- אִמָּצִים *amasim j* Zech. 6.3; cf. s. v. אָדָם.
- אָמָר *αμαρ g* in *Αμαρεια*, 1 Chron. 5.33.
- אִמְרָתִי *αμαρθι ο* Ps. 30.7.
- אִמְרוּ *αμρου ο* Ps. 35.21.
- יִאמְרוּ *ιωμρου ο* Ps. 35.25.
- אָמֵר *εμμηρ g* Jer. 20.1; *emmer j ib.*
- אִמְרָה *εμαραθ ο* Ps. 18.31.
- אִמְרָה *ημεθ ο* Ps. 31.6; cf. in the BV אִמְרָה Prov. 11.18 in
 Ms. Ec 1, and in the PV אִמְרָה Prov. 22.21 (MdWI,
 p. יה).
- אִמְרָתְךָ *εμεθθαχ ο* Ps. 30.10; on the change of *η* in
ημεθ to *ε* in *εμεθθαχ*, see our remarks in paragraph
 XXVIa.
- אָנָּה *αννα ο* Ps. 118.25.
- אָנָּה *anna j* Jon. 4.2.
- אָנוּשׁ *ενωσ A* Gen. 4.26; *enos On ib.*
- אָנוּשׁ *anus j* Isa. 17.11.
- אָנִי *ανι ο* Ps. 89.48.
- וְאָנִי *ουανι ο* Ps. 30.7.
- אֶנַּח *enach j* Amos 7.7.
- אֶנָּכִי *ανωχ ο* Ps. 46.11.
- אֶנְקָה וְאֶנְקָה *ουανακα ο* Mal. 2.13.
- אֶסִּיר *ασειρ B* Ex. 6.4; MT: אָסִיר; *ασηρ A ib.*; *asir On*
ib.; cf. our note on אֱלֹהֵי.
- אֶסָּף *ασαφ g* Isa. 36.3; *asaf On ib.*

וְאֶפְסוֹ ο υ ν ε ε σ α φ ο υ ο Ps. 35.15: ΟΤΝΕCCAΦΟΥ
lege € for first C; cf. s. v. אֶפְסוֹ; cf. Thompson Facs.
5 (€—C).

אסר אסורים assurim j Eccl. 7.26.

אף α φ ο Ps. 89.28.

אף אפּו aphpho j Amos 1.11.

באפּו β α α φ φ ω ο Ps. 30.6; ba aphpho j Isa. 2.22.

אפּוד ephod j Zech. 12.10.

אפּעה eph ee j Isa. 59.5; the second e is probably the trans-
literation of the y; cf. paragraph XXIII sub y.

אפּר באפּר χ α ε φ η ρ ο Ps. 147.16.

אצל asel j Zech. 14.5; cf. MT אצל 1 Chron. 8.37.

אצל asel j Mic. 1.11.

אצר ω σ α ρ B 1 Chron. 1.42; MT: אצר.

אקדח ecda j Isa. 54.11.

ארבה arbe j Hos. 13.3.

ארבה a) orobba j Hos. 13.3.

b) ארובות arobbboth On 1 Ki. 4.10.

ארבע arbee On Gen. 23.2; on the second e cf. paragraph
XXIII sub y.

ארבעים α ρ β α ε ι μ ο 1 Sam. 4.18; arbaim j Jon. 3.4.

ארנן ω ρ γ ε ι μ G 2 Sam. 21.19.

ארגמן argaman j Ezek. 27.16.

ארז araz j Jer. 22.15.

ארח ארחך ο ρ α χ ο Ps. 44.19.

ארי α ρ ι G in Αριηλ, Isa. 29.1; ari j in ariel, ib.

אריה a) α ρ ε ι α B 2 Ki. 15.25; aria j Isa. 21.8 (IV.,
p. 216 A).

b) α ρ ι ε A 2 Ki. 15.25; arie j Isa. 21.8 (IV., p.
305 A).

ארך ο ρ ε χ A Gen. 10.10; MT: ארך; orech On ib.

ארמון armanoth j Jer. 17.27; cf. B-L. §67f and
§260'.

ארץ α ρ s ο Ps. 35.20.

הארץ α α ρ s ο Ps. 46.3; MT: ארץ.

בארץ β α α ρ s ο Ps. 46.9, 11.

לארץ λ α α ρ s ο Ps. 89.40, 45.

אש ε s ο Ps. 89.47.

- בֶּאֱש $\beta a \epsilon s$ o Ps. 46.10.
- אִשָּׁה $i s s a$ j Jer. 1.11; $h i s s a$ j Gen. 2.23; cf. s. v. אִישׁ.
- נָשִׁים $n a s i m$ j Isa. 3.12.
- נֶסֶד $n e s e$ j Zech. 12.12.
- אֲשֹׁרֵנוּ $a s o u p e v o u$ o Ps. 44.19.
- אֲשָׁם $a s a m$ j Hab. 1.11; MT: וְאָשָׁם; cf. in the BV
 בְּאֲשָׁם 2 Sam. 14.13 in Ms. 105 JThS for MT בְּאֲשָׁם;
 וְיָבֵשׁ Job 14.11 in Ms. Ec 1 for MT וְיָבֵשׁ Gen.
 13.2 and שְׁלֵלִים ib. 15.16, both instances in Ms. Ka 2,
 for MT קָבַר and שָׁלֵם respectively. The spelling of
 the transliteration has to be corrected to: uasam;
 cf. paragraph XXIII sub 1.
- אֲשַׁמָּה $a s a m a t h$ j Amos 8.14.
- אֲשֶׁר a) $a s e p$ o Ps. 1.1; $a s e r$ j Isa. 2.22.
 b) $e s e p$ o Ps. 31.8; $e s e r$ j Ezek. 40.49.
- אֲשֶׁר $a s e p$ g Ex. 1.4; $a s e r$ On ib.
- אֲשֶׁרִי $e s e p e r$ o Ps. 1.1.
- אֲשִׁישִׁי $a s i s e$ j Hos. 3.1.
- אֶת $e t$ o Mal. 2.13; Ps. 28.9; $e t h$ j Hab. 3.13.
- אֹתִי $o t i$ o Ps. 31.6.
- אֶתָּה a) $a t a$ o Ps. 18.28.
 b) וְאֶתָּה $o t a$ o Ps. 89.39.

ב

- בֶּ- βa o Isa. 26.3.
- בֹּ βo o Ps. 18.31.
- בָּה βa g in $O\psi\epsilon\iota\beta a$, 2 Ki. 21.1; $b a$ On in Ooliba,
 Ezek. 23.4.
- בָּהֶם $b a h e m$ j Gen. 14.5; MT: בָּהֶם.
- בָּם $\beta a m$ o Ps. 49.15.
- בְּאֵר a) $\beta e r$ g in $B\eta\rho\sigma a\beta e e$, 1 Chron. 21.2; cf. Sam.
 Gen. 24.20: הַבֵּיר (MT: הַבְּאֵר). $b e r$ On in Bersabee,
 ib.
- בְּאֵרֶת $\beta e r o t h$ g Deut. 10.6; $b e r o t h$ On ib.
- b) $\beta e r$ b in $B\eta\rho\sigma a\beta e e$, 2 Chron. 19.4.
- בְּאֵרִי $b e e r i$ On Gen. 26.34.
- בָּאֲשִׁים $b u s i m$ j Isa. 5.2.

- בד bad J Zech. 12.12.
 בדים baddim J Ezek. 9.2.
 בדיו baddau J Hos. 11.6.
 בהל νεβαλ o Ps. 30.8.
 בהלה labala J Isa. 65.23.
 בהמה a) בקהמות χαβημωθ o Ps. 49.13.
 b) בקהמות beemoth J Isa. 30.6.
 בוא βα o Gen. 43.23.
 באו bau J Jer. 32.29.
 וְיִבֹּאוּ ο υ ι α β ω o Isa. 26.2.
 לְבֹאוּ λ α β ω B Ju. 3.3; cf. MT Jer. 46.13; לְבֹאוּ.
 הָבֵא α β β α o Ps. 118.26.
 בוז buz On Gen. 22.21.
 בוזי β ου ζ ει G Ezek. 1.3; buz i On ib.
 בוצ bus J Ezek. 27.16.
 בור β ω ρ o Ps. 30.4; bor J Jer. 6.7.
 בוש ι η β ω σ ου o Ps. 35.26.
 בושׁה βωσα o Ps. 89.46.
 בֶּזֶק β ε ζ ε κ B Ju. 1.4; bezec J Ezek. 1.14; MT: בֶּזֶק.
 בחור βαουρειμ G 2 Sam. 19.17; baurim On ib.
 בחר a) יִבְחַר ι β α α ρ B 1 Chron. 3.6: βααρ lege ιβααρ;
 haplography.
 b) ι ε β α α ρ A ib.
 בֶּטַח bete J Gen. 34.25.
 בֶּטַח β α τ ε o Ps. 28.7.
 בֶּטְחִי β α τ α θ ι o Ps. 31.7.
 וְהַבֹּטֶחַ ο υ α β β ω τ η o Ps. 32.10.
 הַבֶּטְחִים α β β ω τ ε ε ι μ o Ps. 49.7.
 בֶּטְחוּ β ε τ ου o Isa. 26.4.
 בָּטֵן a) β α τ ν ε A Josh. 19.25; cf. in the BV בָּטֵן Prov.
 31.2; בָּטֵן Cant. 7.3 in Ms. Ec 1.
 b) β ε τ εν On Josh. 19.25.
 מְבִטֵּן mebeten J Isa. 46.3; MT: מְבִי־בָטֵן.
 בִּין ι α β ε ι ν B Ju. 4.2; ι α β ι ν o Ps. 92.7; iabin
 On Ju. 4.2.
 הָבִין α β ι ν o Ps. 32.9.

- בית a) הַבֵּית $\alpha \beta \beta \alpha \iota \vartheta$ o Ps. 30.1.
 בית $\beta \alpha \iota \vartheta$ B in Βαυθηλ, Josh. 7.2; cf. s. v. חֵיל sub a).
 ב) הַבֵּית $\beta \eta \vartheta$ A in Βηθανυ Josh. 7.2; $\beta \epsilon \vartheta$ A in Βεθθ-
 ἀποφύε, Josh. 15.53; b e t h On in Bethel, Gen. 12.8.
 לְבֵית $\lambda \beta \eta \vartheta$ o Ps. 31.3.
 מִבֵּית mebbeth J Amos 1.5.
 בֵּיתִי bethi J Gen. 15.2.
 בֵּיתָמוֹ $\beta \eta \vartheta \alpha \mu \omicron \upsilon$ o Ps. 49.12; MT: בְּתִימוֹ.
 בְּכוֹר a) $\beta \chi \omega \rho$ o Ps. 89.28.
 ב) bechor On Gen. 46.21; MT: בְּכֹר.
 בְּכוֹרֶת $\beta \epsilon \chi \omega \rho \alpha \vartheta$ A 1 Sam. 9.1.
 בְּכוֹרָה bechchora J Mic. 7.1.
 בְּכִי $\beta \epsilon \chi \iota$ o Mal. 2.13; Ps. 30.6.
 בֵּל bel J Hos. 2.18.
 בֵּל $\beta \alpha \lambda$ o Ps. 30.7.
 בִּלְה $\iota \epsilon \beta \lambda \omicron \upsilon$ o Ps. 18.46; IEBAOT lege Λ for A.
 לְבִלְה $\lambda \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 49.15.
 בְּלִיעַל $\beta \epsilon \lambda \iota \alpha \lambda$ o Prov. 16.27; cf. in the BV בְּלִיעֵל ib. 6.12;
 in Ms. Ec 1; belial J Isa. 27.1.
 בִּלְם $\lambda \alpha \beta \lambda \omega \mu$ o Ps. 32.9.
 בִּלַּע $\beta \alpha \lambda \alpha$ A Gen. 46.21; MT: בָּלַע.
 בָּלָעַם βαλααμ G Num. 22.5; MT: בָּלַעַם; balaam
 On ib.
 יְבִלַּע $\iota \epsilon \beta \lambda \alpha$ G in Ιεβλααμ, Ju. 1.27; ieb la On in
 Ieb laam, 2 Ki. 9.27.
 בִּלְעֻנְהוּ $\beta \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon$ o Ps. 35.25.
 בִּלְעָדִי מִבְּלָעָדִי $\mu \epsilon \beta \beta \epsilon \lambda \alpha \delta \eta$ o Ps. 18.32; MT: מִבְּלָעָדִי.
 בָּמָה $\beta \alpha \mu \alpha$ G 1 Sam. 9.12; bama On ib.
 בָּמוֹת $\beta \alpha \mu \omega \vartheta$ G Num. 21.19; bamoth On ib.
 בֶּן a) $\beta \epsilon \nu$ A 1 Ki. 4.8; o Ps. 9.1; MT: לְבֶן; ben On in
 Ruben, Gen. 29.32.
 וּבֶן u ben J Gen. 15.2.
 בָּבֶן ba ben J Gen. 1.1.
 בְּנִי benaich J Ezek. 27.4; cf. in the PV בְּנִי (Edel-
 mann, p. 7, line 15); בְּנִי Ex. 13.18 (ib., line 7).
 בְּנוֹ $\lambda \alpha \beta \alpha \nu \iota$ o Hos. 11.1.

- בְּנֵי $\beta a n a i$ B in $Banai\beta akat$, Josh. 19.45.
 $\beta a n \eta$ A in $Ban\eta\beta ara\kappa$, ib.; O Ps. 18.46; b a n e
 On in Banebarac, Josh. 19.45.
- בְּנֵי $\beta a n a u$ O Ps. 89.31.
- c) בְּנֵי $\beta n \eta$ O Ps. 29.1.
 לְבָנֵי $\lambda a \beta n \eta$ O Ps. 49.1; Ps. 46.1: ABNH lege $\Delta ABNH$;
 $\lambda e \beta n \eta$ O Ps. 12.9.
- בְּנֵי בְּנֵי $bonaich$ J Ezek. 27.4.
- בְּעַל $\beta a a \lambda$ G in $Baa\lambda\beta eri\upsilon$, Ju. 9.4; b a a l On in Baal-
 berith, Num. 33.7.
- בְּעָלִי $baali$ J Hos. 2.18.
- בְּעָלִים $\beta a a \lambda e i \mu$ G 1 Sam. 7.4; b a a l i m On ib.
- בְּעֹלָה $bula$ J Isa. 62.4.
- בְּעֹלָה a) בְּעֹלֹת $\beta a \lambda \omega \upsilon$ A Josh. 15.24.
 b) בְּעֹלָה $\beta a a \lambda a$ A Josh. 15.29; b a a l a On ib.
 בְּעֹלֹת $baaloth$ On Josh. 15.24.
- בְּעַר a) בְּעַר $\beta a \rho$ O Ps. 92.7.
 b) בְּעַר וְבְעַר $ou\beta a a \rho$ O Ps. 49.11.
- בְּעַר $\upsilon e \beta a \rho$ O Ps. 89.47.
- בְּצַע $\beta e \sigma e$ O in $\mu e \beta \beta e \sigma e$, Ps. 30.10.
- בְּקָבוֹק a) $boc\beta oc$ J Jer. 19.1.
 b) $\beta a \kappa \beta ou \kappa$ A Ezra 2.51.
- בְּקָע $bace$ J Gen. 24.22.
- בְּקָר a) לְבָקָר $\lambda a \beta e \kappa \rho$ O Ps. 49.15.
 b) בְּקָר $\beta o \kappa \rho$ O Ps. 46.6.
- בְּקָר $bocer$ J Amos 7.14.
- בָּר bar J Zech. 12.12.
- בְּרָא $\beta a \rho a \upsilon a$ O Ps. 89.48.
- בְּרָד $\beta a \rho a \delta$ A Gen. 16.14; MT: בְּרָד; barad On ib.
- בְּרָדִים $borodim$ J Zech. 6.3.
- בְּרִיחַ $bari$ J Isa. 27.1.
 בְּרִיחִים $barihim$ J Isa. 43.14; cf. paragraph X and
 XXIII sub ה.
- בְּרִית a) $\beta e \rho i \upsilon$ B in $Baa\lambda\beta eri\upsilon$, Ju. 9.4; berith On
 Ju. 9.46.
 b) $\beta \rho i \upsilon$ O Ps. 89.40; brith J Mal. 2.4.
- בְּרִיחִי $\beta \rho i \upsilon i$ O Ps. 89.35.
- וּבְרִיחִי $ou\beta \rho i \upsilon i$ O Ps. 89.29.

- ברית *borith* J Jer. 2.22.
 בָּרַךְ *β α ρ α χ* G in *Βαραχιηλ*, Job 32.2; *barach* On in *Barachel*, ib.
 בְּרוּךְ *β α ρ ο υ χ* G Jer. 32.12; o Ps. 118.26; *baruch* On Jer. 32.12.
 וּבָרַךְ *ο υ β α ρ ε χ* o Ps. 28.9.
 בָּרַק *β α ρ α κ* B Ju. 4.6; *harac* On ib.
 בַּר *barura* J Zeph. 3.9.
 תְּהַבֵּר *θ ε θ β α ρ α ρ* o Ps. 18.27: ΘΕΘΒΑΡΑΒ lege P for second B.
 בָּשָׂר a) *basar* J Ezek. 10.12.
 בָּשָׂרִי *basari* J Hos. 9.12; cf. B-L. §26s'.
 בֹּסֵר b) *bosor* J Isa. 34.6; cf. s. v. זָכָר; cf. also the following spellings in Sam: Gen. 11.31: כְּלוּתוֹ (MT: בְּלָתוֹ); ib. 18.33: שׁוּב (MT: שָׁב); Ex. 32.25: בְּקוּמֵיהֶם (MT: בְּמִשְׁקָל); Lev. 26.26: בְּמִשְׁקָל (MT: בְּמִשְׁקָל).
 בִּשְׁת a) *β ο σ θ ε* B in *Ισβοσθε*, 2 Sam. 2.8.
 b) *boseth* On in *Hisboseth*, ib.
 בַּת a) *bath* J Ezek. 45.11; Mic. 4.14.
 b) *beth* J Isa. 5.10.
 בְּתוּלָה *bethula* J Isa. 7.14.

ג

- גָּאָה a) *γ α υ α* o Ps. 31.24: *pava* lege γ for ρ; phonetic mistake: γ before an α and o sounded like ρ.
 b) *β γ η ο υ α θ ω* o Ps. 46.4.
 גֹּאֵן *g a o n* J Hos. 5.5.
 גֵּאֵל a) *ι γ α α λ* B Num. 13.7: ΙΑΑΑΑ lege: ΙΓΑΑΑ; cf. Thompson Facs. 6 (Λ—Γ).
 b) *ι γ α λ* A ib.
 c) *iegal* On ib.
 גּוֹאֵל *goel* J Isa. 59.20.
 גּוֹלָתָךְ *goolathach* J Ezek. 11.15.
 גָּב a) *gab* J Ezek. 43.13.
 b) *gob* J Ezek. 16.24.
 גְּבִים *gebim* J Isa. 10.31.
 גְּבוּל *gebul* J Obad. 20.

- גְּבוּלַיִךְ *ge bula i ch j* Ezek. 27.4: *ge bulaic lege -a'ich*;
cf. paragraph XXIII sub ב.
- גִּבּוֹר a) *γ ι β β ω ρ ο* Isa. 9.5; *g i b b o r j i b*.
b) גְּבוֹרִים *ge b o r i m j* Isa. 13.3.
- גְּבוּרוֹת *ge bu ro th j* Jer. 13.18; cf. in the PV גְּבוּלֹתָיִךְ
Ps. 71.18 (MdWII, p. 86).
גְּבוּרָתוֹ *β ε γ ε β ο υ ρ ο θ α υ ο* Ps. 150.2.
- גְּבִירָה *ge b i r a j* Jer. 13.18.
- גְּבַעָה *γ α β α α G* Josh. 15.57; *g a b a a* On 1 Sam. 10.26.
גְּבַעַת *γ α β α α θ A* Josh. 18.28; *g a b a a t h* On Josh.
24.33.
גְּבַעוֹת *γ α β α ω θ B* Josh. 18.28; MT: גְּבַעַת.
- גָּבַר a) גָּבַר *γ α β ρ ο* Ps. 89.49.
גְּבָרִי *γ α β ρ ι G* in Γαβριηλ, Dan. 8.16.
b) גָּבַר *ge b e r j* Isa. 22.17.
c) גָּבַר *γ α β ε ρ G* Num. 33.35.
- גָּבַר *γ α β ρ ο* Ps. 18.26.
- גְּדוּד *γ ε δ ο υ δ ο* Ps. 18.30; *g e d u d j* Mic. 4.14.
- גָּדוֹל *g a d o l j* Jon. 2.1.
- גְּדֻפָּה *g e d d u p h a j* Ezek. 5.15.
- גָּדַל *י ג ד ל ι ε γ δ ε λ ο* Ps. 35.27.
גָּדַל *γ ε δ δ η λ A* Ezra 2.47.
גְּדַלְתִּי *γ ε δ δ ε λ θ ι A* 1 Chron. 25.29.
הַטְּגִדִּילִים *[α μ] μ α γ δ ι λ ι μ ο* Ps. 35.26.
- גָּדַר *γ α δ ε ρ A* Josh. 12.13; MT: גָּדַר; *g a d e r j* Ezek. 42.7.
- גָּדַר *g o d e r j* Isa. 58.12.
- גְּדָרָה a) *γ α δ η ρ α G* Josh. 15.36; *g a d e r a* On ib.
גְּדָרוֹת *γ α δ η ρ ω θ A* Josh. 15.41; *g a d e r o t h* On ib.
b) גְּדָרְתִּי *γ α δ ρ ω θ α υ ο* Ps. 89.41: ΓΑΔΡΩΘΑC,
lege T for C.
- גִּהּוֹר *σ υ ι ε γ α ρ ο* 2 Ki. 4.35.
- גִּוִּי *γ ω ι ο* Isa. 26.2; *g o i j* Zeph. 2.5.
גִּוִּי *agg o i j* Mal. 3.9.
גִּוִּים *γ ω ε ι μ A* Josh. 12.23; *γ ω ι μ ο* Ps. 46.7.
בְּגוִיִּם *b a g g o i m j* Hab. 1.5.
- גִּוּר *י ג ו ר ι α γ ο υ ρ A* Josh. 15.21; *i a g u r* On ib.
- גָּר *g a r j* Zeph. 2.5.
- גִּזִּי *g o z i j* Amos 7.1; MT: גִּזִּי; cf. Ps. 71.6.

- גזם *gezem* J Joel 1.4; MT: גזם.
 גזע *geza* J Isa. 11.1.
 גזר *γαζερ* G Josh. 12.12; *gazer* On ib.
 גזרה *gazera'* J Ezek. 42.10.
 גאי *γαι* G Deut. 34.6; *gai* On ib.
 גאי *ge* J Isa. 28.1.
 גיל *αγίλα* o Ps. 31.8.
 גילגל *ουγιλου* o Ps. 32.11.
 גל *gal* J Gen. 31.46.
 גלים a) *γαλειμ* B Isa. 10.30.
 b) *γαλλειμ* A ib.; *gallim* J ib.
 גלגל *געלגעל* G Ezek. 10.13; *gelgel* J ib.; cf. MT: גלגל
 Isa. 28.28 and גלגלי ib. 5.28.
 גלולים *gelule* J Ezek. 20.7.
 גלילה *galila* J Ezek. 47.8; cf. MT: גלילי 2 Ki. 15.29.
 גלילוח *γαλιλωθ* A Josh. 22.10; B Josh. 18.17:
 ΓΑΛΙΑΩΘ lege *Λ* for the second *A*; *galiloth*
 J Joel 4.4.
 גלם *גלם* *γολμη* o Ps. 92.7.
 גם *γαμ* o Ps. 49.3.
 גמל *גמל* *γαμαλι* A Num. 13.12; cf. B-L. §24g; B ib.:
 ΓΑΜΑΙ lege ΓΑΜΑΛΙ.
 גמל *גמל* *γαμουλ* B 1 Chron. 24.17.
 גן *γαν* A in *Βαϊαταν*, 2 Ki. 9.27; *gan* J Gen. 2.2.
 גן *agan* On in Bethagan, 2 Ki. 9.27.
 גנים *γαννιμ* A in *Ηνγαννιμ*, Josh. 19.21; *gannim*
 On in Engannim, ib.
 גר *γερ* G in *Γηρσαμ*, Ex. 2.22; *ger* On in Gersom, ib.
 גרו *גרתי* *νερπεσθι* o Ps. 31.23.
 גשם *gesem* J Zech. 14.17.
 גת *געθ* G 1 Sam. 6.17; *geth* On Josh. 11.22; cf. B-L.
 §14c'.

ד

- דאג *דאג* *δωηγ* A 1 Sam. 22.9; *δωηκ* B ib.; *doec* On ib.
 דביר *דאבער* G Josh. 11.21; *דאβיר* o Ps. 28.2; *dabir*
 On Josh. 11.21.
 דבורה *דעבβωρα* G Ju. 4.4; *debbora* On ib.

- דָּבָר a) דָּבָרִי δ α β ρ η ο Ps. 35.20; d a b r e J in Dabre-jamim, 1 Chron. 1.1.
 b) דָּבָר δ α β α ρ G in Λωδαβαρ, 2 Sam. 17.27; d a b a r On in Lodabar, ib.
 דָּבָרִי d a b a r a c h J Hos. 13.14; cf. B-L. §2 w and §26 c'.
 דָּבָר יִדְבָּר יִדְבָּרִי id a b b e r J Isa. 32.6.
 וַיְדַבֵּר וַיְדַבֵּרִי o s u i e d a b b e r ο Ps. 18.48; MT: וַיְדַבֵּר.
 וַיְדַבֵּרוּ יִדְבָּרוּ i d a b b e r ο Ps. 35.20.
 דָּבָר d e b e r J Hab. 3.4.
 דָּבָשֶׁת d a b b a s t h On Josh. 19.11; cf. similarly in the PV חרשת Deut. 26.15 (MdWI, p. i); cf. also s. v. חרשת.
 דָּג d a g J Jon. 2.1.
 הַדָּגִים a d a g i m J Zeph. 1.10.
 דָּדִים d o d i m J Ezek. 16.8.
 דֹּדִי d o d i J Jer. 32.8.
 דֹּדָךְ d o d a c h J Jer. 32.7.
 דָּן δ α ν A Gen. 14.14; d a n On ib.
 דֹּר δ ω ρ G in Αελδωρ, 1 Sam. 28.7; d o r On in Aendor, ib.
 לְדֹר λ δ ω ρ ο Ps. 49.12: ΑΔΩΡ lege ΑΔΩΡ (Α for A) or ΑΑΔΩΡ (Α before A, haplography).
 וְדֹר ο u s a δ ω ρ ο Ps. 49.12; cf. in the PV וְדֹר (Bar, p. 22).
 דִּיּוֹת d a j o t h J Isa. 34.15.
 דָּלָג ε δ α λ λ ε γ ο Ps. 18.30.
 דָּלִיּוֹתִי δ ε λ λ ι θ α ν η ο Ps. 30.2.
 דָּלָף דָּלָף i e d l a φ A Gen. 22.22: ΙΕΛΔΑΦ lege: ΙΕΔΛΑΦ; cf. in the BV יִדְלֵף Eccl. 10.18 in Ms. Ec 1; i e d l a f On Gen. 22.22.
 דָּם β δ α μ ι ο Ps. 30.10.
 דָּמִי d a m e J Isa. 38.10; MT: דָּמִי.
 דָּמִינוּ δ ε μ μ η ν ο u ο Ps. 48.10.
 נָדָמוּ ν ε δ μ ο u ο Ps. 49.13.
 דָּמוּ δ α μ μ ο u ο Ps. 35.15.
 יָדֹם i a δ o m ο Ps. 30.13; MT: יָדֹם.
 דָּמָא d e m a ο Mal. 2.13.
 דָּעָה d e a J Isa. 28.9.
 דָּעָת d a a t h J Eccl. 8.6.

- דק doc J Isa. 40.22.
 דקו dacaru J Zech. 12.10.
 דרור deror J Ezek. 46.17.
 דרך a) $\delta \epsilon \rho \chi \circ$ Ps. 89.42.
 בדרך $\beta \delta \epsilon \rho \chi \circ$ Ps. 32.8.
 דרך $\delta \epsilon \rho \chi \iota \circ$ Ps. 18.33; cf. in the BV דרכם
 Prov. 1.31; דרכי ib. 3.17; in Ms. Ec 1.
 דרך $\delta \epsilon \rho \chi \omega \circ$ Ps. 18.31; cf. in the BV דרכו
 Prov. 11.5; in Ms. Ec 1.
 b) דרךם $\delta \alpha \rho \chi \alpha \mu \circ$ Ps. 49.14.
 דרש drusa J Isa. 62.12.

ה

- האח aa \circ Ps. 35.21.
 הבל a) $\alpha \beta \lambda \eta \circ$ Ps. 31.7.
 b) $\alpha b \alpha l$ J Eccl. 1.2; cf. in the BV $\alpha b \alpha l$ ib. in
 Ms. Ec 1.
 הבלים $\alpha b \alpha l i m$ J Eccl. 1.2.
 c) $\alpha \beta \epsilon \lambda$ A Gen. 4.2; $\alpha b \epsilon l$ On ib.
 הנה $\theta \alpha \alpha \gamma \epsilon \circ$ Ps. 35.28; $\Theta \Delta \Delta \Gamma C$, lege ϵ for C.
 הקיון a) $\epsilon \gamma \alpha \omega \nu \circ$ Ps. 92.4: $E I \Delta \Omega N$ lege Γ for I; cf.
 Thompson Facs. 3.
 b) $\epsilon \gamma \gamma \alpha \omega \nu \circ$ Ps. 9.17.
 הגית $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \gamma \iota \theta \circ$ Ps. 49.4; MT: $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \gamma \iota \theta$.
 הד ad J in adarim, Ezek. 7.7.
 הדרה $\beta \alpha \alpha \delta \alpha \rho \epsilon \theta \circ$ Ps. 29.2.
 הוא $\sigma \upsilon \circ$ Ps. 18.31; hu On Ex. 16.15 s. v. man.
 הוד $\omega \delta$ A 1 Chron. 8.6; MT: $\alpha \chi \delta$; hod J Zech. 6.13.
 הוי oi J Isa. 29.1.
 הקה $\alpha \epsilon \alpha \circ$ Ps. 89.42; h a j a J Zeph. 3.18.
 היתי $\alpha \iota \theta \iota \circ$ Ps. 30.8.
 הקה $\iota \epsilon \iota \epsilon \circ$ Ps. 89.37; cf. in the PV $\iota \epsilon \iota$ Ps. 69.23;
 ib., 26 (MdWII, p. 84).
 הקיו $\theta \sigma \upsilon \circ$ Ps. 32.9.
 הקה $\alpha \iota \eta \circ$ Ps. 30.11.
 היכל $\eta \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \chi \circ$ Ps. 48.10.
 הליל elil J Isa. 14.12.
 הין hin J Ezek. 4.11.

- הֶלֶךְ α λ α χ o Ps. 1.1.
 חֶלֶךְ θ η λ η χ o Ps. 32.8.
 לָכֹ λ χ ο υ o Ps. 46.9.
 יִלְכֹן ι α λ λ η χ ο υ ν o Ps. 89.31; MT: יִלְכֹן.
 יִהְיֶה לְךָ ε θ α λ λ α χ θ ι o Ps. 35.14.
 הֵלֵל ε λ λ η λ B Ju. 12.13.
 יֵהֱלֵל ι α λ λ ε λ A in Ιαλλεληλ, 1 Chron. 4.16.
 הֵלֵל ε ε λ λ ε λ ε χ o Ps. 35.18: CΕΛΛΕΛΕΧ, lege
 Ε for C; cf. Thompson Facs. 5.
 הֵלֵל allelu j in alleluia, Isa. 26.4.
 מֹלֵל mola l j Eccl. 2.2.
 יִהְיֶה לֵוִי ι θ α λ λ α λ ο υ o Ps. 49.7.
 הֵם ε μ o Ps. 9.7; MT: הֵם.
 הֵמוּ α μ ο υ o Ps. 46.7.
 יֵהֱמוּ ι ε ε μ ο υ o Ps. 46.6.
 הֵמָּה h o m a j Jer. 4.19; MT: הֵמָּה.
 הֵמוֹן a) a m u n j Isa. 33.3.
 b) α μ ω ν G in Βεεθλαμων, Cant. 8.11.
 הֵמוֹנָה a m o n a j Ezek. 7.13.
 הֵמוֹנִים a m o n i m j Joel 4.14.
 הֵמָּסִים a m a s i m j Isa. 64.1.
 הֵפֶךְ α φ α χ θ o Ps. 30.12.
 הֵרָ ρ A in Αρσαφαρ, Num. 33.23; o Ps. 48.3.
 הֵרִים α ρ ι μ o Ps. 46.3; a r i m j Amos 4.13.
 לְהֵרִי λ α α ρ α ρ ι o Ps. 30.8.
 הֵרֶם a) a r e s j Isa. 19.18.
 b) h e r e s j Isa. 24.23.

↑

- זֶבֶךְ ζ η β G Ju. 7.25; z e b On ib.
 זֶשֶׁבֶט ζ ω θ o Ps. 49. 2.
 זֶשֶׁבֶט ο υ ζ ω θ o Mal. 2.13.
 זָבֹד a) α β δ ε ι. G 1 Chron. 8.19; z a b d i On Josh.
 7.1.
 b) זָבֹד z e b d i On Josh. 7.1.
 c) זָבֹד ζ α β ε δ G 1 Chron. 2.36; MT: זָבֹד.

- זבד a) ζ α β ο υ θ B 1 Ki. 4.5.
b) ζ α β β ο υ θ A ib.
- זבוב z e b u b On in Baalzebub, 2 Ki. 1.2.
- זבול ζ ε β ο υ λ G Ju. 9.28; z e b u l On ib.
- זבח a) ζ ε β ε ε G Ju. 8.5; the last ε is the transliteration of the ח; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח; cf. in the PV זבֿח (Bar. p. 20).
b) z e b a J Ezek. 46.20.
- זבלי זבֿלני i e z b u l e n i J Gen. 30.20.
- זה ζ ε ο Ps. 49.14.
- זהב a) ζ ο ο β A in Μεζοοβ, Gen. 36.39.
b) z a a b On in Mezaab, ib.
- זהר z o r J Ezek. 8.2.
- זו a) ζ ο υ ο Ps. 32.8.
b) z o J Hag. 1.1.
- זח זחֿי ι α ζ ε ι ζ B 1 Chron. 27.31.
- זולתי ζ ο υ λ α θ ι ο Ps. 18.32.
- זחל זחֿלה ζ ω ε λ ε θ A 1 Ki. 1.9; z o e l e t h On ib.
- זיו z i z J Isa. 66.11.
- זכר z o c h o r J Isa. 26.14; cf. s. v. זכֿר sub b).
- זכר a) λ ζ ε χ ρ ο Ps. 30.5: AZEXP lege AZEXP or AAZEXP.
זכרי ζ ε χ ρ ε ι B Ex. 6.21; z e c h r i On ib.
b) זכר z a c h a r J Isa. 26.14.
- זכר ζ α χ α ρ A in Ιωζαχαρ, 2 Ki. 12.22; z a c h a r On in Iozachar, ib.
- זכור η ζ χ ο ρ ο Ps. 89.51; MT: זכֿר.
- זכר ζ χ ο ρ ο Ps. 89.48.
- זמה ζ ε μ μ α B 1 Chron. 6.5; z e m m a J Ezek. 16.27.
- זמר a) זמרי ζ α μ β ρ ε ι B Num. 25.14; the Septuagint frequently renders the letters מר by μ β ρ; f. i.: Gen. 46.13: שמרון ζ α μ β ρ α μ; Ex. 6.18: עמרם α μ β ρ α μ; Num. 32.3: נמרה ν α μ β ρ α.
ζ α μ β ρ ι A Num. 25.14.
z a m r i On ib.
b) זמרי z e m e r i On Num. 25.14.
- זמר זמֿרד ι ζ α μ μ ε ρ ε χ ο Ps. 30.13.
- זמרו ζ ω η μ ε ρ ο υ ο Ps. 30.5.

- זמרה זמרת *z e m r o t h* J Isa. 24.16; MT: זמרת; cf. the relation of MT זמרת in Ex. 33.22 to the form בזקירות in the Sam; Gen 4.23; MT: זמרת and Sam. אמרת.
- זנונים *z a n u n i m* J Hos 1.2.
- זנח זנח *z a n o e* Ps. 89.39.
- זנוח זנוח *z a n o e* A Josh 15.34; *z a n o e* On ib.; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.
- זער זער *z e r* J Isa. 28.10.
- זרח a) זרח *z a r a* G Num. 26.20.
 זרחי *z a r a e i* B Num. 26.20; *z a r a i* A ib.
 b) זרח *z a r e* On Num. 26.20.
- זרח זרח *z a r a* A 1 Chron. 6.6; *z a r a* On Gen. 36.13.
 זרח *z a r a e* A 1 Chron. 4.24; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.
 זרח *z a r e* B in *Z a r e i a*, Ezra 8.4.
 זרח *z e s p a e* B 1 Chron. 27.8: ECPAE lege IECPAE, haplo.; cf. Thompson Facs. 6 (I—E); also ¶ XXIII sub ח.
- זרע a) זרע *z e r a* J Isa. 1.4.
 b) זרע *z a r a* J Ezek. 31.17.
 זרעו *z a r o* Ps. 89.30.
- זרע זרע a) זרע *z e r a* B in *I s r a e l*, 1 Sam. 29.1.
 זרע *z e r a* A in *I s r a e l* A, ib.
 b) זרע *z e r a* A in *I e z r a e l*, Josh. 17.16; *i e z r a* On in *I e z r a h e l*, ib.
 זרועותי *z e r o s o t a i* Ps. 18.35; MT: זרועותי.

ח

- חבל חבל *h a b e l* Ps. 7.15; MT: חבל.
- חבר חבר *h a b e r* B Ju. 4.11; *h a b e r* On Gen. 46.17.
 חבר *h a b e r* A 1 Chron. 4.18; *h a b e r* On Num. 26.45; MT: חבר.
- חבר חבור *h a b o r* G 2 Ki. 17.6.
- חג חג *h a g g i* B Num. 26.15; *h a g g i* A ib.; *h a g g i* On ib.
- חגא חגא *h a g g a* J Isa. 19.17.
- חגב חגב *h a g a b* G Ezra 2.46.
 חגב חגב *h a g a b* J Eccl. 12.5.
- חד חד *h a d d a* A in *H a d d a*, Josh. 19.21; *h a d d a* On in *E n a d d a*, ib.

- קדל edel j Isa. 38.11.
 קדל יִקְדֹּל $\iota \epsilon \delta \alpha \lambda \circ$ Ps. 49.9; MT: יִקְדֹּל.
 קדלו hedalu j Isa. 2.22; with retention of the 2nd vowel (against B-L. §26 d").
- חדש $\alpha \delta \alpha \sigma \alpha$ A Josh. 15.37; adasa On ib.
 חדש a) hodes j Hos. 4.6.
 b) חדשי o dsi On 2 Sam. 24.6.
- חובה choba On Gen. 14.15.
 חול $\sigma \upsilon \lambda$ A Gen. 10.23; ul On ib.
- חומה homa j Isa. 24.23.
- חוקם $\chi \omega \vartheta \alpha \mu$ A 1 Chron. 7.32.
 חוק $\alpha \zeta \alpha$ G in Αζαηλ, 1 Ki. 19.15; aza On in Azahel, ib.
 חוו $\epsilon \epsilon \zeta \circ \upsilon$ o Ps. 46.9; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.
- חיון hazon j Hab. 2.2.
 חזיון ezzahon On 1 Ki. 15.18; MT: חזיון.
- חזיו חזיונים azizim j Zech. 10.1.
- חק חק $\epsilon \zeta \alpha \kappa$ o Ps. 31.25; $\epsilon \zeta \alpha \chi$ lege $\epsilon \zeta \alpha \kappa$; MT: חקיו. The ϵ may be considered as a transliteration of the ח; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח; or otherwise cf. in the BV the corresponding vocalization with ח in forms like חֹהֵב Job 38.3 in Ms. Ec 5; חֹמֶר Ezek. 33.10 in Ms. Eb 10.
- חקק $\epsilon \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \kappa$ o Ps. 35.2.
- חטא חטאים $\alpha \tau \tau \alpha \epsilon \iota \mu$ o Ps. 1.1.
- חטאת attath j Gen. 4.7; hata th j ib. (editio Lagarde).
- חי $\alpha \iota$ o Ps. 18.47.
- חידה חידתי $\iota \delta \alpha \vartheta \iota$ o Ps. 49.5.
- חיה חיה יִחְיֶה $\iota \epsilon \iota \epsilon$ o Ps. 89.37.
 חיי jeju j Isa. 26.19.
 חייתי $\iota \iota \vartheta \alpha \nu \iota$ o Ps. 30.4: $\iota \vartheta \alpha \nu \iota$ lege $\iota \vartheta \alpha \nu \iota$.
 חיהו heieu j Hab. 3.2.
- חיל a) $\chi \alpha \iota \lambda$ G in Αβειχαιλ, Num. 3.35.
 $\alpha \iota \lambda$ o Ps. 18.40.
 חילם $\alpha \iota \lambda \alpha \mu$ G 2 Sam. 10.16; cf. s. v. חיתו sub a).
 b) חילם $\eta \lambda \alpha \mu$ o Ps. 49.7; cf. MT: חֵיל 2 Ki. 18.17.
- חיים $\alpha \iota \iota \mu$ o Ps. 30.6.
- חיץ his j Ezek. 13.10.
- חיק חיקי $\eta \kappa \iota$ o Ps. 35.13.

- יְחֻכִּי β η η κ ι ο Ps. 89.51.
- יְחֻכִּי ech cha j in alechcha, Hos. 8.1.
- יְחֻכִּי a χ α μ ι μ ο Ps. 49.11.
- יְחֻכִּי a χ α μ ω θ ο Ps. 49.4; MT: יְחֻכִּי.
- יְחֻכִּי eled j Isa. 38.11.
- יְחֻכִּי a) ο λ δ ο Ps. 49.2; MT: יְחֻכִּי.
- יְחֻכִּי b) holed j Isa. 38.11.
- יְחֻכִּי β α α λ ω θ α μ ο Ps. 35.13.
- יְחֻכִּי helem j Zech. 6.10.
- יְחֻכִּי oli On Josh. 19.25; MT: יְחֻכִּי.
- יְחֻכִּי ε λ λ ε λ θ ο Ps. 89.40.
- יְחֻכִּי α α λ λ ε λ ο Ps. 89.35.
- יְחֻכִּי ι α λ λ η λ ο υ ο Ps. 89.32.
- יְחֻכִּי χ α ω λ ε μ ι μ ο Ps. 126.1.
- יְחֻכִּי eluse j Isa. 15.4.
- יְחֻכִּי α λ α κ A Josh. 11.17; alac On ib.
- יְחֻכִּי χ ε λ ε κ A Num. 26.30.
- יְחֻכִּי χ ε λ ε κ ι A ib.
- יְחֻכִּי elec On Josh. 17.2.
- יְחֻכִּי ε ε λ ι κ ο Ps. 36.3; cf. paragraph XXIII sub n.
- יְחֻכִּי χ ε λ κ α θ A Josh. 19.25.
- יְחֻכִּי elcath On ib.
- יְחֻכִּי χ α μ A Gen. 10.1; cham On ib.
- יְחֻכִּי hamma j Isa. 24.23.
- יְחֻכִּי a) ε μ α θ α χ ο Ps. 89.47.
- יְחֻכִּי b) α μ α θ ι A Gen. 10.18; amathi On ib.
- יְחֻכִּי ε μ μ ω ρ G Ju. 9.28; cf. in the BV לְחַמְדִּי Ju. 19.19; וְחַמְדִּי 1 Sam. 27.9 in Ms. 105 JThS; this vocalization (ḥ) would imply a gemination of the following ם according to the rules of the Masoretic Grammar; cf. MTK, p. 27.
- יְחֻכִּי emor On Gen. 33.19.
- יְחֻכִּי amul On Gen. 46.12.
- יְחֻכִּי a) ο υ ο μ ρ ο Hos. 3.2.
- יְחֻכִּי b) ο μ ε ρ j Hos. 3.2.
- יְחֻכִּי homer j Ezek. 45.13.
- יְחֻכִּי ι ε μ ρ ο υ ο Ps. 46.6.
- יְחֻכִּי hen j Jer. 31.2.

- חנה h a n a J Isa. 29.1.
 חנית a ν ι θ ο Ps. 46.10.
 חנם ε ν ν α μ ο Ps. 35.19.
 חנן a ν α ν' G in Ελεαναν, 2 Sam. 21.19; a n a n On in Elianan, ib.
 חנון α ν ο υ ν G Neh. 3.13.
 חתחנן ε θ α ν ν α ν ο Ps. 30.9.
 חנה בְּחֶנְפִּי β α α ν φ η ο Ps. 35.16.
 חנה o n e p h J Isa. 32.6.
 חסד ε σ δ A 1 Ki. 4.10; ο Ps. 32.10.
 חסדי ε σ δ ι ο Ps. 89.29; cf. in the BV חסדִי Ps. 107.43 in Ms. Ec 1.
 בחסדך β ε ε ζ δ α χ ο Ps. 31.8; H-R: β ε ε λ δ α χ.
 חסדו ε σ δ ω ο Ps. 31.22; cf. in the BV חסדִי Ps. 100.5 in Ms. Ec 1.
 חסדִיך ε σ δ α χ ο Ps. 89.50.
 חסה חסיתי α σ ι θ ι ο Ps. 31.2.
 חסמים α ω σ ι μ ο Ps. 18.31.
 לחסים λ α ω σ ι μ ο Ps. 31.20.
 חסיד α σ ι δ ο Ps. 18.26.
 חסידיו α σ ι δ α υ ο Ps. 31.24.
 חסידה a s i d a J Jer. 8.7.
 חסיל h a s i l J Joel 1.4.
 חפה χ ο φ φ α B in Ο χ χ ο φ φ α, 1 Chron. 24.13.
 ο φ φ α A ib.
 חפוי β α α φ ζ ι ο Ps. 31.23.
 חפץ חפצִי a) α ψ ε ι B in Α ψ ε ι β α, 2 Ki. 21.1.
 b) ο φ σ ι A in Ο φ σ ι β α ib.
 c) e p h s i J Isa. 62.4; e b s i On in Ebsiba, 2 Ki. 21.1.
 d) e p h e s i J in epesiba lege ephesiba, Isa. 62.4.
 חפץ חפצִי α α φ η ς ο Ps. 35.27; Α Λ Φ Η ς lege A for Λ
 חפצִי ω φ σ η ο Ps. 35.27; MT: חפצִי.
 חפר חפרו ο υ τ ι φ ρ ο υ ο Ps. 35.26; cf. in the BV ויחפרו Ps. 35.4 in Ms. Ec 1.
 חפר חפר־פרות p h a r p h a r o t h J Isa. 2.20.
 חצי חצי ε σ ε ι A 1 Chron. 2.52.

- חצר a) $\alpha \sigma \rho$ B in *Ἀρσεναιμ* lege *Ἀρσεναιμ*, Num. 34.9.
 b) $\alpha \sigma \alpha \rho$ A in *Ἀσαρμωθ*, Gen. 10.26; *as ar On* in Asarmoth, ib.
 c) $\alpha \sigma \epsilon \rho$ A in *Ἀσερναιμ*, Num. 34.9; *as er On* in Asergadda, Josh. 15.27.
 חצרות $\alpha \sigma \eta \rho \omega \theta$ G Num. 11.35; *aseroth On* ib.
 חרב *areb J* Zech. 13.7.
hareb J Zeph. 2.14; Hag. 1.11; MT: חרב.
 חרב $\chi \omega \rho \eta \beta$ G Ex. 3.1.
oreb On ib.
 חרבה $\alpha \rho \beta \omega \theta$ O Ps. 9.7; MT: חרבות.
 חרנ $\sigma \upsilon \epsilon \rho \sigma \gamma \sigma \upsilon$ O Ps. 18.46.
 חרד $\sigma \upsilon \chi \alpha \rho \delta \sigma \upsilon$ O Ps. 49.15; MT: וַיִּחַדּוּ.
 חרדה *arada On* Num. 33.24.
 חרה *ara J* Jon. 4.4.
 חריף $\alpha \rho \epsilon \iota \varphi$ B Neh. 7.24.
 חרם *herem J* Ezek. 44.29.
 חרם $\alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ G Ju. 8.13; MT: חרם; *ares On* ib.
 חרסית *harsith J* Jer. 19.2.
 חרף $\eta \rho \varphi \sigma \upsilon$ O Ps. 89.52.
 חרפה $\alpha \rho \varphi \alpha$ O Ps. 89.42: APΦ lege APΦA, haplography before a Λ.
 חרפה $\alpha \rho \varphi \alpha \theta$ O Ps. 89.51.
 חרץ $\alpha \rho \upsilon \varsigma$ G 2 Ki. 21.19; *arus On* ib.
harus On Joel 4.14.
 חרצות *arsoth J* Amos 1.3.
 חרק $\alpha \rho \omega \kappa$ O Ps. 35.16.
 חרש $\alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ J Isa. 19.18.
 חרש $\alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ A 1 Chron. 9.15.
 חרש *hores J* Isa. 17.9.
 חרש $\alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \mu$ J Hos. 10.13.
 יְהֹרֶשׁ *jeros J* Hos. 10.11; cf. in the BV יְהֹרֶשׁ Prov. 20.4 in Ms. Ec 1.
 תְּהַרֵּשׁ $\theta \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ O Ps. 35.22; MT: תְּהַרֵּשׁ.
 חרשֶׁת *arasth On* Ju. 4.2; MT: חֲרָשֶׁת; cf. s. v. דַּבְּבַשֶּׁת *dabbasth*.
 חשב $\alpha \sigma \alpha \beta$ G in *Ἀσαβια*, 1 Chron. 9.14.
 חֲשַׁבָּה $\alpha \sigma \sigma \upsilon \beta \epsilon$ B 1 Chron. 3.20.
 נְחֻשָּׁב *nesab J* Isa. 2.22.

- יְדִידָהּ $\iota \delta \iota \delta \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 45.1.
 יָדַע $\iota \alpha \delta \alpha$ A in Βαλλιαδα, 1 Chron. 14.7.
 $\iota \alpha \delta \alpha \epsilon$ B in Ελιαδαε, 1 Ki. 11.14; o Ps. 92.7; MT: יָדַע;
 cf. paragraph XXIII sub γ; i a d a h e On in
 Ioiadahe, 2 Sam. 23.20; cf. paragraph X.
 יָדָעָה $\iota \alpha \delta \alpha \vartheta$ o Ps. 31.8.
 יָדָעוּ $j a d a u$ J Hos. 9.7; MT: יָדָעוּ; cf. B-L. §2w.
 יָדָעוּ $o \nu \alpha \delta o \nu$ o Ps. 46.11.
 יָה $i a$ J Isa. 26.4.
 יָהּ $\beta a i a$ o Isa. 26.4.
 יֵהָב $\alpha \beta o \nu$ o Ps. 29.1.
 יְהוָה $\alpha \delta \omega \nu a i$ o Ps. 118.25; a d o n a i J Isa. 7.12.
 יְהוָה $\beta \alpha \delta \omega \nu a i$ o Isa. 26.4.
 יוֹם $b i o m$ J Isa. 17.11.
 הַיּוֹם $a i \omega \mu$ o Ps. 35.28.
 יָמִים $i a m i m$ J Gen. 35.18.
 יָמִי $\iota \mu \eta$ o Ps. 89.46.
 בְּיָמִי $\beta i \mu \eta$ o Ps. 49.6.
 בְּיָמִי $\chi i \mu \eta$ o Ps. 89.30.
 יוֹנָה $\iota \omega \nu a$ G 2 Ki. 14.25; i o n a On ib.
 יֵזַע $j e z e$ J Ezek. 44.18.
 יָחַד $\iota \alpha \alpha \delta$ o Ps. 49.3; $\iota \alpha \alpha \delta \epsilon$ o Ps. 49.11; I find this form
 inexplicable, unless by assuming that ϵ is the
 scribe's suggestion for the second α : $\iota \alpha \epsilon \delta$; cf. para-
 graph XXIII sub η.
 יָחַדָּהּ $\iota \alpha \delta \alpha \nu$ o Ps. 35.26: ΙΔΑῩ lege ΙΑΔΑῩ, haplography
 A before Δ.
 יָחִיד $j a i d$ J Jer. 6.26.
 יָחִידָהּ $\iota \iota \delta \alpha \vartheta i$ o Ps. 35.17; cf. in the BV יָחִידָהּ Gen.
 22.2 in Ms. Ea 1.
 יְחִלִּים $\alpha \mu \mu \eta \alpha \lambda i \mu$ o Ps. 31.25; MT: יְחִלִּים.
 יָם $i a m$ J Isa. 2.16.
 מֵיָם $m e j a m$ J Hos. 11.10.
 יָמִים $\iota \alpha \mu i \mu$ o Ps. 46.3.
 יָמִין a) $\iota \alpha \mu \epsilon i \nu$ A Gen. 46.10; i a m i n On ib.
 b) יָמִין $\iota \mu i \nu$ o Ps. 89.43.
 וְיָמִין $o \nu \iota \mu i \nu \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 18.36: ΟΤΕΜΙΝΑΧ, lege I
 for Ε; cf. Thompson Facs. 6.

- יָמִינוּ *μινω* o Ps. 89.26.
 c) *יעמענע* B Ps. 7.1; *יעמענ* A ib.; *iemini*
 On ib.
- יִנְקָה *meneca* J Gen. 35.8 (editio Lagarde): *mene-*
cha is a misprint; MT: מִינְקָה.
 מִינְקָה *meneceth* J Gen. 35.8.
- יֹסֵף *ωσσηφ* G Gen. 30.24; *ioseph* On ib.
- יְעֹד *νωαδ* A in *Νωαδα*, Ezra 8.33.
- יֹעֵץ *ioes* J Isa. 9.5.
- יָעַר a) *ιαρ* A 1 Sam. 14.25; *jar* J Hos. 2.15; cf. in
 the PV לִיעֵר Isa. 32.15 (MdWI, p. יב).
 יָעִיר *αρειμ* B Josh. 15.9; *αριμ* A ib.; *iarim*
 On in Cariathiarim, ib.
 b) *ιααρ* B 1 Sam. 14.25: *Iaαλ* lege *ρ* for *λ*.
- יָצָא *jasα* J Zech. 2.7; MT: יָצָא.
 יֹצִיאֲנִי *θωσινηνι* o Ps. 31.5: ΘΩΣΙΗΝΙ dele O;
 dittography; cf. Thompson Facs. 3 and 5 (Θ—O).
- יָצַר a) *ιερ* A Num. 26.49.
 יָצְרוּ *ιερσο* o Isa. 26.3; MT: יָצַר.
 b) *ιερσερ* B Num. 26.49; *ieser* On ib.
 יָצַרִי *ιερσει* B ib.
- יֹצֵר *joser* J Zech. 11.12.
- יָקַר *βιακαρ* o Ps. 49.13: BAKAP lege BIAKAP;
 cf. in the PV יָקָר (MdWI, p. יז, line 3).
- יָקַר *οσικαρ* o Ps. 49.9; cf. MT וַיִּיקַר 1 Sam. 18.30.
- יָרָא *ιρα* o Ps. 49.7.
 יָרֵא *νρα* o Ps. 46.3.
 יָרָא *αρη* o Ps. 112.1: APH lege IAPH.
- יָרֵאֵד *λiriaχ* o Ps. 31.20.
- יָרַד *jered* J Jon. 1.3.
 יָרִידִי *μειωρδη* o Ps. 30.4.
 יָרִידִיתִי *βρεδεθι* o Ps. 30.10; the addition of the
 suffix does thus not result in a change of the vocali-
 zation of the verb; cf. in the Sam. Ex. 32.34:
 פָּקְדִי as compared with the Masoretic form פָּקְדִי.
- יָרַח *οσωρεχ* o Ps. 32.8.
- יְרוּשָׁה *ερουσσα* A 2 Chron. 27.1.
ερουσσα B ib.

- יָרֵחַ i are J Amos 4.7; i are e On Gen. 10.26; MT: יָרֵחַ;
cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.
- יָרֵחַ χ ι α ρ η o Ps. 89.38.
- יָרִיב ι ρ ι β α ι o Ps. 35.1; perhaps to be explained as
an amalgamation of the two readings: יָרִיבִי ι ρ ι β ι
and ι ρ ι β α ι: cf. on מַעֲמוֹ.
- יִרְכֵּה ι ρ χ θ η o Ps. 48.3; cf. in the BV יִרְכֵּה־ Ju. 19.18
in Ms. 105 JThS.
- יֵשׁ i s J Gen. 30.18.
- יֵשׁב ι α σ α β o Ps. 29.10.
- יֵשׁב η η σ η β o Ps. 9.8.
- יֹשֶׁבֶת josebeth J Mic. 1.11.
- יִשׁוּעָה a) יִשׁוּעָתִי ι α σ σ υ α θ ι o Ps. 89.27.
b) לִישׁוּעָה lajesua J Hab. 3.13; MT: לְיִשְׁע; cf. in the
PV יִשׁוּעָתִי Ps. 69.30 (MdWII, p. 85).
c) יִשׁוּעוֹת ι σ σ ο σ υ ω θ o Ps. 28.8.
- יִשָּׁן ι α σ α ν G 2 Sam. 23.32: α σ α ν lege ι α σ α ν, haplography;
MT: יִשָּׁן; i a s a n On ib.
- הַיִּשָּׁנָה α ι σ α ν α G Neh. 3.6.
- יִשְׁעִי ι ε σ ε ι A 1 Chron. 2.31; o Ps. 18.47: I E C C I is to
be emended in I E C E I, the second ε corresponding
to the ע, cf. paragraph XXIII sub ע, or in I E C I;
dittography.
- יִשְׁעָךְ ι ε σ α χ α o Ps. 18.36.
- יִשְׁע תוֹשִׁיעַ θ ω σ ι o Ps. 18.28: Θ Ω Ε Ι lege G for E.
- יִשְׁע מוֹשִׁיעַ μ ω σ ι o Ps. 18.42.
- יִשְׁעִים m o s i m J Obad. 21.
- הוֹשִׁיעָה ω σ ι α o Ps. 28.9: Ι Ω Γ Ι Α lege Ω C I A.
- נָא הוֹשִׁיעָה ω σ ι ε ν ν α o Ps. 118.25.
- לְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי λ ω σ η ν ν ι o Ps. 31.3.
- יִשְׂרִי ι ρ ρ η o Ps. 32.11.
- יִשְׂר isar J Hos. 12.5; cf. וְיִקָּר s. v. יָקָר; MT: וְיִשְׂר.
- יָתֵד j a t h e d J Isa. 22.25.
- יָתֵר a) יִתְרוֹ i e t h r o On Ex. 3.1.
b) יָתֵר ι ε θ ε ρ o Ps. 31.24
- יָתֵר תוֹתֵר θ ω θ α ρ o Gen. 49.4.

כ

- כָּאֵב *cheb* j Isa. 29.4; MT: כָּאֵב.
 כְּבוֹד *χ α β ω δ* o Ps. 29.1; *cha bod* j Isa. 11.10.
χ α β ω θ G in *Βαρχαβωθ*, 1 Sam. 4.21.
caboth On in Escaboth, 1 Sam. 14.3.
 הַקְּבוֹד *α χ χ α β ω δ* O Ps. 29.3.
 כְּבוֹד *χ α β ω δ* O Ps. 29.2.
 כְּבִרְתָּה *chabratha* On 2 Ki. 5.19.
 כְּדֹד *chodchod* j Isa. 54.12.
 כּוֹכַב *chocab* j Amos 5.26.
 כּוֹן *ι ε χ χ ο ν* o Ps. 89.38.
 הֶכִין *hechin* j Amos 4.12; MT: הֶכִין.
 יָכִין *ι α χ ε ι ν* G Num. 26.12; *iachin* On Gen. 46.10.
 כְּנֻיִם *chauonim* j Jer. 7.18.
 כָּסַב *chasab* j Isa. 28.17.
 כּוֹב *ε χ α ζ ε β* o Ps. 89.36; without gemination of the second radical; cf. שִׁמְחָה, פִּתְחָה, פִּלְט, וְהִאֲזִינִי, under their respective headings.
 כְּחֶשׁוֹ *chaesu* j Zech. 13.4; the e=ח, cf. paragraph XXIII.
 כִּי *χι* o Ps. 18.28; *chi* j Isa. 2.22.
 כִּידּוֹן *chidon* On Josh. 8.18.
 כִּיּוֹן *chion* j Amos 5.26.
 כִּימָה *chima* j Amos 5.8.
 כִּכְרִי *chachar* j Zech. 5.7; cf. in the BV כִּכְרִי 2 Chron. 9.13 in Ms. Ec 1.
κεχαρ B 2 Sam. 18.23.
 כָּל a) *χ ω λ* A in *Εσχωλ*, Gen. 14.24; *χ ο λ* o Ps. 31.24;
chol On in *Fichol*, Gen. 21.22.
κο λ A in *Φικολ*, Gen. 21.22.
 לְכָל *λ α χ ο λ* o Ps. 18.31.
 בְּלֶה *chollo* j Ezek. 11.15; cf. in the BV כּוֹלֵם Berakot 6, 2 (Kahle, "The Mishna Text in Babylonia", *HUCA*, Cincinnati, 1935).
 b) *chullo* j ib.
 כָּלָה *χ ε λ λ ω θ α μ* o Ps. 18.38.
 כְּלוּב *chelub* j Amos 8.2.

- בְּלִיָּן κ ε λ α ι υ ν B Ruth 1.2; MT: בְּלִיָּן; cf. in the PV בְּלִיָּן
(= כליון) Isa. 10.22 (Kahle in ZAW 1901, p. 282).
- בְּקָה χ α μ μ α ο Ps. 35.17.
- בְּמוֹ χ α μ ω ο Ps. 89.47.
- בְּמֶר a) χ ω μ α ρ ε ι μ G 2 Ki. 23.5; chomarim
On ib.
b) בְּחֻמָּרִים acchumarim J Zeph. 1.4.
- בֶּן χ ε ν ο Ps. 46.3; chen J Zech. 11.11.
- בְּנוֹר chennor On Ezek. 26.13.
- בְּבִנוֹר β χ ε ν ν ω ρ ο Ps. 49.5.
- בְּנַעֲנִי chanani On Ex. 3.8.
- בְּנָף mecchenaph J Isa. 24.16; cf. in the PV
כְּנָפִי Ezek. 16.12 (MdWII, p. 70).
- כְּסֹא ο υ χ ε σ σ ω ο Ps. 89.30.
- כְּסֹה χ ε σ σ ο υ θ ο Mal. 2.13.
- כְּסִיל a) chasil J Amos 5.8.
b) כְּסִילֵי chisile J Isa. 13.10.
כְּסִילֵי־עֵם chisileem J Isa. 13.10.
c) כְּסִיל χ σ ι λ ο Ps. 49.11: XϛΙΛ lege C for ϛ.
כְּסִיל ο υ χ σ ι λ ο Ps. 92.7.
- כְּסֵל χ ε σ λ ο Ps. 49.14.
- כְּסֵלֵו chasleu J Zech. 7.1.
- כְּסָמִים chasamim J Isa. 28.17.
- כְּעֵס β α χ α s ο Ps. 31.10.
- כְּפָה chaphphe J Isa. 19.25.
- כְּפֹר χ ε φ ο ρ ο Ps. 147.16.
- כְּפִים chaphis J Hab. 2.11.
- כְּפִיר a) chaphir J Ezek. 38.13.
caphir J ib.
b) כְּפִירִים μ ε χ φ ε ρ ι μ ο Ps. 35.17.
- כְּפָרוֹ χ ο φ ρ ω ο Ps. 49.8.
- כְּפֹתֹרִים caphthorim J Amos 9.1,7.
- כֶּר χ ο ρ G in Βαυθχορ, 1 Sam. 7.11.
- כְּרוֹב a) χ α ρ ο υ β B Neh. 7.61.
b) χ ε ρ ο υ β A Neh. 7.61; cherub J Ezek. 9.3.
כְּרוּבִים χ ε ρ ο υ β ε ι μ G Ex. 25.18; cherubim
Ezek. 9.3.

- הַכְּרוּבִּים accherubim On Ex. 25.20: accherubin
lege m for n.
- כָּרֶם χ α ρ μ ο Ps. 12.9; MT: כָּרֶם.
χ α ρ μ α' b in Βαυθδαχαρμα, Jer. 6.1; charma
On in Bethacharma, ib.
- כַּרְמֵי χ α ρ μ ε ι b Ex. 6.14; χ α ρ μ ι α ib.; charmi
On ib.
- כַּרְמֵי χ α ρ μ ε ι μ b in Εβελχαρμειν lege-ειμ, Ju.
11.33.
- כַּשְׁפִּי cassaphe j Jer. 27.9.

ל

- לִי λ ι ο Ps. 18.36; li j Isa. 24.16.
- לָךְ λ α χ ο Ps. 110.3; l a c j Jon. 4.4.
- לוֹ λ ω ο Ps. 89.29.
- לָנוּ λ α ν ο υ ο Ps. 46.8; l a n u j Isa. 6.8.
- לָכֶם l a c h e m j Isa. 2.22.
- לָהֶם l a e m j Mic. 7.13; l a h e m j Isa. 33.7; cf.
paragraph X and XXIII sub ה.
- לָמוֹ λ α μ ο υ ο Ps. 28.8.
- לֹא λ ω g in Λωδαβαρ, 2 Sam. 17.27; o Ps. 32.6; l o On
in Lodabar, 2 Sam. 9.4.
- לֹא ul o j Isa. 7.12.
- לֵב λ ε β ο Ps. 32.11.
- בְּלֵב β λ ε β ο Ps. 46.3.
- לִבִּי λ ε β β ι ο Ps. 28.7.
- לְבוֹ λ ε β β α υ ο Ps. 36.2; MT: לִבִּי.
- לִבָּ a) לֵבִיכָם λ ε β β α β ε χ ε μ ο Ps. 31.25.
b) בְּלִיכָם β α λ β α β α μ ο Ps. 35.25; MT: בְּלִיכָם; cf.
Gen. 18.5: MT: לִיכָם Sam. לבבכם.
- לְבוֹנָה λ ε β ω ν α g Ju. 21.19.
- לְבוֹשׁ λ ε β ο υ σ ι ο Ps. 35.13.
- לְבִאוֹת l a b a o t h On in Bethlabaoth, Josh. 19.6.
- לָבָן λ α β α ν A Gen. 24.29; l a b a n On ib.
- לְבָנָה λ α β α ν α g Neh. 7.48; MT: לְבָנָה; l a b a n a j
Isa. 24.23.

- לבנה *lebena* J Isa. 24.23.
 להב *laabim* On Gen. 10.13.
 לה *illaue* J Gen. 30.34 (editio Lagarde).
 לִיָּתָן *leviathan* J Isa. 27.1.
 לוח *alluoth* J Hab. 2.2.
 לקח a) לקח *λαεμ* B in *Βαυθαλαεμ*, 1 Chron. 2.51; the *ε* is = *π*, cf. paragraph XXIII sub *π*.
 b) לקח *λεεμ* G in *Βαυθλεεμ*, Ju. 12.10; the second *ε* = *π*; cf. paragraph XXIII sub *π*.
 לקחי *λεεμει* A 1 Chron. 20.5; see the note on לקח
 לחם לקח *λωαμαιο* Ps. 35.1.
 לחם *λοομ* O Ps. 35.1; MT: לקח; cf. in the BV לֶחֶם.
 Prov. 9.5 in Ms. Ec 1, for MT לקח.
 לחש *חלחש* a) *αλωης* B Neh. 10.25.
 b) *αλλωης* A Neh. 3.12.
 לטש *לטש* *λατουσιειμ* A Gen. 25.3.
latusim On ib.
 לילית *lilith* J Isa. 34.14.
 לין *ιαλιν* O Ps. 30.6.
 לִיָּנִי *thalinu* J Isa. 21.13.
 לִישׁ a) *λαεις* B 1 Sam. 25.44: AMEIC lege *AAEIC*;
 cf. Thompson Facs. 3; *λαις* A ib.
 b) *leis* J Isa. 30.6.
 למד *מד* *μαλαμμεδ* O Ps. 18.35.
 לקח *λαμα* O Ps. 49.6.
 למען *λαμαν* O Ps. 30.13.
 למען *ουλμαν* O Ps. 31.4.
 לעג *לעג* *λαγη* O Ps. 35.16.
 לפידות *λαφειδωθ* B Ju. 4.4; *λαφιδωθ* A ib.; *lapidoth*
 On ib.
 לג *לצים* *λησιμ* O Ps. 1.1.
 לקראת *lacerath* J Amos 4.12.
 לשון *ולשון* *ουαλσωνι* O Ps. 35.28.
 לשונות *λσωνωθ* O Ps. 31.21.
 לתך a) לתך *ουλεθχ* O Hos. 3.2.
 b) לתך *lethech* J Hos. 3.2.

מ

- קאר $\mu\omega\delta\circ$ Ps. 46.2.
 מאה מאת $ma'ath$ J Eccl. 8.12.
 קאור $maor$ J Isa. 24.23.
 מאזנים מאזני $mozene$ J Ezek. 45.10.
 מאכל $machal$ J Ezek. 47.12; cf. in the BV מֹאכֵל Ps.44.12
 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מאס $o\upsilon\alpha\theta\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\circ$ Ps. 89.39.
 מבוכה $mabucha$ J Mic. 7.4.
 מבקר $\mu\alpha\beta\alpha\rho$ A 1 Chron. 11.38.
 מבצר $\mu\alpha\psi\alpha\rho$ G 2 Sam. 24.7; $\mu\alpha\beta\sigma\alpha\rho$ A 1 Chron.1.53;
 mabsar On Gen. 36.42; cf. in the BV הַמְבָצֵר
 2 Chron. 17.19 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מבצרי $\mu\alpha\beta\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\upsilon\iota\circ$ Ps. 89.41.
 מבשם $\mu\alpha\beta\sigma\alpha\mu$ A 1 Chron. 1.29; $Ma\beta\sigma\alpha\nu$ lege μ for ν ; cf. in
 the BV מְבֹשֶׁם 1 Chron. 4.25 in Ms. Ec 1; $ma\ b\text{-}$
 $s\ a\ m$ On Gen. 25.13.
 מג mag On in Rabmag, Jer. 39.3.
 $\mu\alpha\kappa$ A in $\Pi\alpha\beta\mu\alpha\kappa$, ib.
 מגדל $\mu\alpha\gamma\delta\alpha\lambda$ A Josh. 15.37; cf. in the BV מִגְדָּל Prov. 18.10
 in Ms. Ec 1; $magdal$ On in Magdalgad, Josh.
 15.37; J Ezek. 29.10; MT: מְגִדֵּל.
 מגור $magur$ J Jer. 20.3.
 מגלה $megella$ J Zech. 5.1.
 מגן $\mu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\circ$ Ps. 18.31.
 ומגני $o\varsigma\sigma\mu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\iota\circ$ Ps. 28.7; H-R: $o\upsilon\mu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta$; cf.
 in the BV מְגִנָּיו Job 15.26 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מגן $amaggenach$ J Hos. 11.8.
 מגר $\mu\alpha\gamma\alpha\rho\theta\circ$ Ps. 89.45; MT: מְגִרָה.
 מגרש $magras$ J Ezek. 48.17; cf. in the BV מְגִרְשֵׁה 1 Chron.
 6.43 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מדבר $\mu\alpha\delta\beta\alpha\rho$ B in $Ma\delta\beta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\upsilon\delta\iota$, Josh. 5.5; cf. in the BV
 מִדְבָּר Prov. 21.19 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מדר $t\ h\ a\ m\ o\ d\ d\ u$ J Ezek. 47.18.
 מדון $\mu\alpha\delta\omega\nu$ A Josh. 11.1; $madon$ On ib.

- מָה a) $\mu\alpha$ o Ps. 89.47; מָה; m a j Amos 4.13.
בָּמָה b a m a j Isa. 2.22; b a m m a j ib.
- מֶה b) $\mu\epsilon$ o in $\mu\epsilon\beta\beta\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$, Ps. 30.10.
מָה $\mu\eta$ o Ps. 89.48.
- מֶהְרָה $\mu\eta\eta\rho\alpha$ o Ps. 31.3.
- מוֹג $\theta\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\gamma$ o Ps. 46.7.
- מוֹט $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$ o Ps. 46.7.
 $\theta\epsilon\mu\mu\omicron\upsilon\tau$ o Ps. 46.6: ΘEMMOT lege ΘEMMOTT ;
cf. Thompson Facs. 5 and 6 (Y—T).
 $\omicron\upsilon\beta\alpha\mu\omega\tau$ o Ps. 46.3.
- מוֹטָה a) m o t a j Isa. 58.6.
b) מוֹטָה m u t o t h j Jer. 28.13.
- מוֹל m u l j Mic. 2.8.
- מוֹצָא $\omicron\upsilon\mu\omega\sigma\alpha$ o Ps. 89.35.
- מוֹקֵשׁ m o c e s j Amos 8.2.
- מוֹר $\beta\alpha\alpha\mu\iota\rho$ o Ps. 46.3.
- מורֶשֶׁת m a r a s e t h j Mic. 1.14.
- מוֹת a) $\mu\alpha\upsilon\theta$ o Ps. 89.49; cf. B.-L. §17b'.; cf. s. v. מוֹת sub a).
b) $\mu\omega\theta$ B in $\text{B}\eta\theta\alpha\sigma\mu\omega\theta$, Neh. 7.28; A in $\text{A}\sigma\alpha\rho\mu\omega\theta$.
Gen. 10.26; o Ps. 49.15; m o t h On in Asarmoth
Gen. 10.26.
- מוֹתוֹ $\iota\alpha\mu\omega\theta\omicron\upsilon$ o Ps. 49.11: $\iota\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\theta\omega$ lege $\iota\alpha\mu\omega\theta\omicron\upsilon$
- מוֹבַח מוֹבַח $\mu\alpha\sigma\beta\eta\eta$ o Mal. 2.13; cf. in the BV מוֹבַח 2 Sam.
24.21 in Ms. Eb 12; stat. constr. מוֹבַח Ps. 43.4 in
Ms. Ec 1.
- מוֹזֵר a) m e z u r j Hos. 5.13.
b) m e z o r j ib.
- מוֹמֵר $\mu\alpha\zeta\mu\omega\rho$ o Ps. 29.1.
- מוֹרַח מִימִיזְרָא m i m i z r a j Gen. 2.8.
- מוֹחֹל a) $\mu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\lambda$ A 1 Ki. 5.11.
b) m a o l On ib.
 $\lambda\mu\alpha\omega\lambda$ o Ps. 30.12.
- מוֹחֶלָה a) $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha$ G Num. 26.33; MT: מוֹחֶלָה, here and in the fol-
lowing instances.
 $\mu\alpha\epsilon\lambda\alpha$ B 1 Chron. 7.18; ϵ corresponds η , cf. para-
graph XXIII sub η .
b) $\mu\alpha\alpha\lambda\alpha$ G Num. 36.11; m a a l a On Num. 26.33.
- מוֹחֶמֶד m a m a d j Hos. 9.6.

- מחנה מַחְנֵים *manaim* On Josh. 13.26.
 מקסה *μασεο* Ps. 46.2.
 מחץ *μασσημ* Ps. 18.39.
 מקסה *μεεθ·α* Ps. 89.41.
 קטה a) *meta* J Gen. 48.2.
 b) *metta* J ib., editio Lagarde.
 קטה *mate* J Ezek. 4.16.
 מי *μιο* Ps. 18.32.
 מים *μαειμ* A in *Μασρεφωθμαειμ*, Josh. 11.8; *μαιμ* A in *Αβελμαιν*, lege *μ* for *ν*, 2 Chron. 16.4; *maim* J Hos. 11.10.
 מים *αμμαιμ* Ps. 29.3.
 מימי *μημαυ* Ps. 46.4.
 מישור *μεισωρ* G Deut. 3.10; *misor* On ib.
 משר *messarim* J Isa. 26.7.
 מכאוב *μαχωβιμ* Ps. 32.10.
 מכונה *μεχωνωθ* G 1 Ki. 7.27; *mechonoth* On ib.
 מקתב *machthab* J Isa. 38.9; cf. in the BV מִכְתָּב Deut. 10.4 in Ms. Ka 19.
 מקתש *machthes* J Zeph. 1.11.
 מלא *מלאה* *malea* J Nah. 3.1.
 מלא *מלא* *יעמלא* A 2 Chron. 18.7; *iemla* On 1 Ki. 22.8;
 MT: *מלה*.
 מליתי *μελληθι* A 1 Chron. 25.26; MT: *מלותי*.
 מלאך *malach* J Hag. 1.13.
 מלאכי *malachi* J Mal. 1.1.
 מלאכי *malache* J Isa. 14.32.
 מלוא a) *μελω* A 1 Ki. 9.15.
 b) *mello* J Isa. 38.8.
 מלח a) *μελε* B in *Πεμελε*, 2 Ki. 14.7; the second *ε* is the transliteration of the *η*, cf. paragraph XXIII sub *η*; this is, therefore, a *qitl*-form; cf. in the PV מֶלֶח (MdWI, p. יט, line 13).
 b) *μελα* A in *Γαιμελα*, 2 Ki. 14.7.
 מלחמה *מלחמה* *ουμαλαμα* Ps. 76.4; cf. in the BV מִלְחָמָה Prov. 20.18 in Ms. Ec 1.
 במלחמה *βαμμαλαμα* Ps. 89.44; cf. in the BV בְּמִלְחָמָה 1 Chron. 7.40 in Ms. Ec 1.

- מִלְחָמָה לַאֲמַלְאֵם o Ps. 18.35.
 מִלְחָמָה מַלְאֲמֹוֹ o Ps. 46.10; cf. in the BV מִלְחָמָה
 1 Chron. 16.9 in Ms. Ec 1.
- מִלֵּט מִלֵּט; לַאֲמַלְלֵט o Ps. 89.49.
- מִלְכִּי a) מַלְכִּי mal chi On in Malchihel, Num. 26.45.
 מִלְכִּי לַאֲמַלְחֵי o Ps. 89.28.
 b) מִלְכִּי מַעֲלֵי ב in מַעֲלֵי־בֵן, Num. 26.45; cf. in
 the BV מִלְכִּי־בֵן 1 Chron. 9.12 in Ms. Ec 1 for מִלְכִּי
 מַעֲלֵי; מַעֲלֵי א in מַעֲלֵי־בֵן, Num. 26.45;
 mel chi On in Melchisedec, Gen. 14.18; cf.
 B-L. §14c'.
- מִלְכֵּחַ mel che chem J Amos 5.26.
 מִלְכֵּחַ מַעֲלֵי־א 1 Chron. 8.9.
- c) מִלְכֵּחַ מַעֲלֵי ב in אֲדָרַמֶּלֶךְ, 2 Ki. 17.31; me le ch
 On in Adramelech, ib.
 מַעֲלֵי־א in אֲדָרַמֶּלֶךְ, ib.
- מִלְכֵּחַ am me le ch J Zech. 14.10.
- מִלְכֹּם mel chom J Zeph. 1.5; MT: מִלְכֹּם.
- מִלְכָּיִם mal caim J Isa. 6.6.
- מִמְזֵר mam zer J Zech. 9.6.
- מִמְלָכָה מִמְלָכָה מַאֲמַלְאֲחֹוֹ o Ps. 46.7: ΜΑΛΛΑΧΩΘ lege
 M for first Λ; cf. Thompson Facs. 3.
- מִמְשַׁק מִמְשַׁק mam asac J Zeph. 2.9.
- מֵן man On Ex. 16.15.
- מֵן men J Isa. 2.22.
- מִמְנִי a) מִמְנִי o Ps. 35.22.
 b) mem menni J 2 Ki. 4.27.
- מִנָּה מִנָּה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה; i em na On ib.
- מִנָּה מִנָּה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה; t ha m na On ib.
- מִנִּי a) מִנִּי o Ps. 44.19. b) menni J Isa. 46.3.
- מִנֹּד מִנֹּד; מִנֹּד; o Ps. 44.15.
- מִנֹּחַ a) manue On Ju. 13.2. b) מִנֹּחַ; g ib.
- מִנֹּחַתוֹ m nu atho J Jer. 11.10.
- מִנְחָה a) מִנְחָה; מִנְחָה; o Mal. 2.13.
 b) מִנְחָה; manaa J Jer. 17.26.
- מִנְעַיִם מִנְעַיִם; מִנְעַיִם; 1 Chron. 7.35: IMANA lege IMNA;
 cf. Thompson Facs. 3 (M—A).
- מִנְעַיִם מִנְעַיִם; מִנְעַיִם; A Gen. 36.12; t ha m na On ib.

- מסרת מְמַסְרֹתֶיהֶם $\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\gamma\omega\rho\omega\vartheta\epsilon\epsilon\iota\mu$ o Ps. 18.46:
MEMACTΩPΩΘEEIM lege Γ for T; cf. Thompson
Facs. 3.
- מִסְפָּר $\mu\alpha\sigma\varphi\alpha\rho$ G Neh. 7.7; cf. in the BV מִסְפָּר Job 5.9 in
Ms. Ec 1.
- מֵעַר $\mu\alpha\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon$ o Ps. 18.37.
- מְעוֹג $\mu\alpha\omega\gamma$ o Ps. 35.16.
- מְעוֹז $\mu\alpha\omicron\zeta$ o Ps. 31.3; $ma\omicron z$ J Isa. 30.3.
מְעוֹזֵי $\mu\alpha\omicron\zeta\iota$ o Ps. 31.5; cf. in the BV מְעוֹזֵי ib.; מְעוֹזִים
ib. 37.39 in Ms. Ec 1; cf. B-L. §14q.
- מְעוֹן $\mu\alpha\omega\nu$ A 1 Chron. 2.45; $ma\omicron n$ On Josh. 15.55.
 $\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$ B 1 Chron. 2.45; the ϵ may be considered as the
rendering of the γ , cf. paragraph XXIII sub ϵ ;
 $me\omicron n$ On in Bahalmeon, Num. 32.38.
- מֵעַט $\mu\alpha\tau$ o Ps. 8.6; cf. the bisyllabic form in the PV מֵעַט
and מֵעַט Job 10.20 (MdWI, p. יב); cf. s. v. שָׂאֵר.
- מַעִיל $ma\iota l$ J Isa. 61.10.
- מַמְעַל $mem\omicron al$ J Isa. 6.2.
- מַפְעֵל $\mu\alpha\varphi\alpha\lambda\omega\vartheta$ o Ps. 46.9; cf. in the BV מַפְעֵלֶיךָ
Prov. 8.22 in Ms. Ec 1.
- מִפְקָד $\mu\alpha\varphi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\delta$ G Neh. 3.31.
- מִצָּא $emsa$ J Zech. 12.5; MT: אֶמְצָא.
לְמִצָּא $\lambda\alpha\mu\sigma\omega$ o Ps. 36.3.
וְנִמְצָא $\nu\epsilon\mu\sigma\alpha$ o Ps. 46.2.
- מִצָּב $\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\beta$ G 1 Sam. 14.1.
- מִצּוּרָה $\omicron\upsilon\mu\sigma\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\vartheta\iota$ o Ps. 31.4.
מִצּוּרוֹת $\mu\sigma\omicron\upsilon\delta\omega\vartheta$ o Ps. 31.3.
- מִצּוּה $\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\omega\vartheta\alpha\iota$ o Ps. 89.32: OTMCΩΘAI lege
OTMACΩΘAI; cf. Thompson Facs. 3 (M—A);
in the BV מִצּוּחֶיךָ Lev. 26.15 in Ms. Ea 13.
- מִצּוּר a) $masur$ J Hab. 2.1.
b) $\mu\alpha\sigma\omega\rho$ o Ps. 31.22; $masor$ J Mic. 7.12.
- מִצְהָלָה $mesaloth$ J Zech. 14.20; MT: מִצְלוֹת.
- מִצּוּלָה $mesuloth$ J Zech. 14.20; MT: מִצְלוֹת.
- מִצְרַיִם $mezraim$ J Isa. 19.1.
 $\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\rho\alpha\iota\mu$ o Hos. 11.1.
- מִקְהֵלָה $\mu\alpha\kappa\eta\lambda\omega\vartheta$ G Num. 33.25; $maceloth$ On
ib.

- מקום מקומה *macoma* j Nah. 1.8.
 מקל מקלות *macaloth* j Zech. 11.7.; cf. B.-L. §14a'.
 מקנה *macne* j Jer. 9.9; cf. in the BV מִקְנֶה Eccl. 2.7 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מר מרה *mara* On Ex. 15.23.
 מרות *maroth* j Mic. 1.12.
 מרחב במרחב *β α μ μ α ρ [α β]* o Ps. 31.9.
 מרכבת מרְכָבוֹת *μαρχαβωθ* A in Βαυμαρχαβωθ, 1 Chron. 4.31; *marchaboth* On Josh. 19.5.
 מרמה *μαρμα* A 1 Chron. 8.10; cf. in the BV מִדְמָה Prov. 11.1 in Ms. Ec 1.
 ומדמוֹת *μαρμωθ* o Ps. 35.20; cf. in the BV ומדמוֹת Ps. 38.13 in Ms. Ec 1.
 מרעים *mr̥im* j Isa. 1.4.
mereim j ib.
 מרפא *marphe* j Eccl. 10.4.
 מרץ נמרצת *nimrezeth* j 1 Ki. 2.8.
 משא *μασση* A Gen. 25.14.
massa On ib.; j Isa. 19.1.
messa j Isa. 13.1.
 משאל *μασσααλ* A Josh. 21.30.
 משגב *μιογαβ* o Ps. 46.8.
 משי a) *mesi* j Ezek. 16.13.
 b) *messe* j Ezek. 16.10.
 משיח a) מְשִׁיחַ *μσιαχ* o Ps. 89.52; but perhaps should MCIA~~X~~ be corrected to M~~E~~CIA~~X~~? haplography: ϵ before C; cf. Thompson Facs. 9.
μεσιαχ o Ps. 89.39.
 משיחו *μεσιω* o Ps. 28.8.
 b) מְשִׁיחַ *messiach* j Hab. 3.13.
 משיחו *messio* j Amos 4.13.
 משר מוֹשְׁעִים *mosechim* j Jer. 5.8; MT: מוֹשְׁעִים.
 מִשְׁכֵּי *mosche* j Isa. 66.19.
 משכן מְשַׁכְנִי *μεσχνη* o Ps. 46.5: MCXNH lege M~~E~~CXNH.
 מְשַׁכְנֵם *μιοσχνωθαμ* o Ps. 49.12.
 משל *μασαλ* A 1 Chron. 6.59; *masal* j Isa. 14.4.
 למשל *λαμασαλ* o Ps. 49.5; so according to H-R: Wutz has the spelling: *λαμεσαλ*.

- משל $\nu\epsilon\mu\sigma\alpha\lambda$ o Ps. 49.13.
 משמץ $\mu\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$ A Gen. 25.14; cf. in the BV מִשְׁמָץ 1 Chron. 4.25
 in Ms. Ec 1; m a s m a On Gen. 25.14.
 משפח $mesph'a a$ J Isa. 5.7.
 משפט $mesphat$ J Isa. 5.7.
 למשפט $\lambda\alpha\mu\epsilon\sigma\phi\alpha\tau\iota$ o Ps. 35.23.
 ובמשפט $ουβ\mu\epsilon\sigma\phi\alpha\tau\iota$ o Ps. 89.31: ΟΥΒΜCΦΑΤΙ
 lege ΟΥΒΜΕCΦΑΤΙ; MT: ובמשפט.
 משק $masec$ On Gen. 15.2.
 $mesec$ J ib.; mesech is a mistake, dele h; cf. para-
 graph XXIII sub p.
 משקה $memmasce$ J Ezek. 45.15.
 משרה $mesra$ J Isa. 9.6.
 משרפות $\mu\alpha\sigma\rho\epsilon\phi\omega\vartheta$ A in Μασρεφωθμαειμ, Josh.
 11.8.
 $masarfoth$ On ib.
 מתח $methecha$ J Isa. 26.19: metheca is a mistake
 cf. paragraph XXIII sub ב.
 מתג $\beta\alpha\mu\epsilon\vartheta\gamma\epsilon$ o Ps. 32.9.
 מתן $\mu\alpha\vartheta\alpha\nu$ B 2 Ki. 24.17; MT: מתנה; $\mu\alpha\tau\vartheta\alpha\nu$ A
 2 Chron. 23.17; matthan On 2 Ki. 11.18.
 מתנה $mathana$ On Num. 21.18.
 $matthana$ J Eccl. 7.7.

נ

- נאות $naoth$ J Joel 1.20.
 נאם $\nu\sigma\sigma\mu$ o Ps. 36.2.
 נאר $\nu\eta\rho\vartheta$ o Ps. 89.40.
 נביא $nebia$ J Jer. 28.1.
 $nebibim$ J Zech. 13.2.
 $nebeim$ J Jer. 28.1.
 נבל a) $\nu\epsilon\beta\lambda$ o Ps. 92.4; MT: נָבֵל.
 b) $nebel$ J Jer. 13.12.
 נבל $\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda$ G 1 Sam. 25.3; n a b a l On ib.
 נבלה $nabala$ J Isa. 32.6.
 נבר $\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\rho$ o Ps. 18.26.
 נגב $negeb$ J Isa. 30.6.

- נגד $\nu \epsilon \gamma \delta$ o Ps. 31.20.
 לנגד $\lambda a \nu \epsilon \gamma \delta$ o Ps. 36.2.
 מנגד $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \delta$ o Ps. 31.23.
 נגדי $\nu \epsilon \gamma \delta \iota$ o Ps. 89.37.
 נגד $a \iota \epsilon \gamma \gamma \iota \vartheta$ o Ps. 30.10: AIEΓΓΙΘΙ lege AIEΓΓΙΘ.
 נגה a) $\nu a \gamma a \iota$ B 1 Chron. 3.7. b) $\nu a \gamma \epsilon$ A ib.
 נגה $[\iota] a \gamma \iota$ o Ps. 18.29.
 נגע $\sigma \upsilon \beta a \nu \gamma a \iota \mu$ o Ps. 89.33.
 נגע $\iota \gamma \gamma \iota \sigma \upsilon$ o Ps. 32.6.
 נגש $nog es$ J Zech. 10.4.
 נדב $\nu a \delta a \beta$ G Ex. 6.23; MT: נָדָב; n a d a b On ib.
 נדבֿה $n a d a b o t h$ J Amos 4.5.
 נהל $\sigma \upsilon \vartheta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 31.4: OTONEEANI lege
 OTONEEΛHNI; cf. §73a; cf. Thompson Facs. 5
 (N—H).
 נהר a) $\sigma \upsilon \beta a \nu a \rho \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 89.26.
 b) $\nu a a \rho$ o Ps. 46.5.
 נום $\iota a \nu \sigma \upsilon \mu$ A Josh. 15.53; i a n u m On ib.
 נזם $nez em$ J Ezek. 16.12.
 נזר $\nu \epsilon \zeta \rho \omega$ o Ps. 89.40.
 נחג $\vartheta \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 31.4.
 נחל $neh el$ J Ezek. 47.7; cf. paragraph X and XXIII
 sub ח.
 נחלה $neh el a$ J Isa. 17.11; see the note on נחל.
 נחלתך $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \lambda a \vartheta a \chi$ o Ps. 28.9.
 נחם $\mu a \nu a \eta \mu$ G 2 Ki. 15.17; m a n a e m On ib.
 נחמה $n a a m a t h i$ J Zech. 8.14; MT: נַחֲמָתִי.
 נחש $\nu a a s$ G 2 Sam. 17.25; n a a s On ib.
 נחש $\nu \epsilon o \upsilon \sigma a$ o Ps. 18.35.
 נחח $n a a t h$ On Gen. 36.13.
 נחת $\sigma \upsilon \nu a a \vartheta a$ o Ps. 18.35; MT: וְנָחָתָה.
 נטה $\sigma \upsilon a \vartheta \epsilon \tau$ o Ps. 44.19.
 אָטָה $a t t e$ o Ps. 49.5.
 הָטָה $e t t \eta$ o Ps. 31.3.
 נחאת $necho t h a$ J Gen. 43.11.
 נחחה $necho t h a$ J Isa. 39.2.
 נכון $\nu a \chi \omega \nu$ A 2 Sam. 6.6.
 נכים $\nu \eta \chi \iota \mu$ o Ps. 35.15.

- נָכַר $\nu \eta \chi a \rho$ o Ps. 18.46.
 נֶמֶר $n e m e r$ j Jer. 5.6.
 נִסָּה $e n a s s e$ j Isa. 7.12.
 נִסִּיךְ $n e s i c h e$ j Mic. 5.4.
 נִסָּס $m e t h n o s a s o t h$ j Zech. 9.16.
 נֶעֱמָנִים $n e a m e n i m$ j Isa. 17.10.
 נֶעֱם a) $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu$ G in $A \beta \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu$, Ju. 4.6; the second ϵ is a transliteration of the ν ; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ν .
 b) $n o e m$ On in Abinoem, ib.; see the preceding note.
 נֶעֱצוּץ $n e s u s$ j Isa. 55.13.
 נֶעַר $\nu \epsilon \rho$ o Hos. 11.4.
 נִפְּלִים a) $n i f i l i m$ j Gen. 6.4 (editio Lagarde).
 b) $a n n a p h i l i m$ j Gen. 6.4.
 נֶפֶל $t h e p h p h o l$ j Ezek. 8.1.
 נֶפֶל $\iota \epsilon \varphi \varphi o \lambda o u$ o Ps. 18.39.
 נֶפְתּוּלִי $n e p h t h u l e$ j Gen. 30.8; $n e p t u l e$ j ib. (ed. Lagarde).
 נֶפֶשׁ $\nu \epsilon \varphi \sigma \iota$ o Ps. 30.4.
 נֶפֶשׁ $\nu \epsilon \varphi \sigma \omega$ o Ps. 89.49.
 נֶפֶשׁ $\nu \epsilon \varphi \sigma \iota \nu o u$ o Ps. 35.25.
 נֶצַח $\lambda a \nu e s$ o Ps. 49.10.
 נֶצַח $\lambda a \mu a \nu a \sigma \sigma \eta$ o Ps. 31.1; $l a m a n a s s e$ j praefatio in Dan.
 נָצִיב a) $\nu a \sigma \epsilon \iota \beta$ B Josh. 15.43; $n a s i b$ On ib.
 b) $\nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \beta$ A ib.
 נֶצֶל $\epsilon \sigma \iota \lambda \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 31.3.
 נֶצֶר $n e s e r$ j Isa. 11.1.
 נֶצֶר $c h a n e s e r$ j Isa. 14.19.
 נֶצֶר $\vartheta \epsilon \sigma a \rho$ o Isa. 26.3.
 נֶצֶר $\vartheta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 32.7.
 נֶצֶר $\nu \omega \sigma \eta \rho$ o Ps. 31.24.
 נֶצוּרִי $n e s u r e$ j Isa. 49.6.
 נָקַב $\nu a \kappa \epsilon \beta$ A Josh. 19.33.
 נָקַד $n o c e d i m$ j Amos 1.1.
 נִקְמָה $\nu a \kappa a \mu \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 18.48.
 נֶר $\nu \eta \rho$ G 2 Sam. 14.51; $n e r$ On ib.

- נשא $\sigma \alpha \theta \iota$ o Ps. 89.51.
 וְנָשָׂא $\sigma \upsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \eta \mu$ o Ps. 28.9.
 נשג $\sigma \upsilon \epsilon \sigma \iota \gamma \eta \mu$ o Ps. 18.38.
 נשה a) $\mu \alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \eta$ B Gen. 41.51; manasse On ib.
 b) $\mu \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \eta$ A ib.
 נשיא nasi J Ezek. 46.12.
 נשמה nasama J Isa. 2.22.
 נשמות nasamoth J Isa. 57.16.
 נשף neseph J Isa. 21.4.
 נשפה nesepha J Jer. 13.16; MT: נשף.
 נתיב $\nu \alpha \theta \iota \nu \epsilon \iota \mu$ A Ezra 2.58.
 הנתיב $\alpha \nu \nu \alpha \theta \iota \nu \epsilon \iota \mu$ A in Βηθανναθινιμ, Neh. 3.31.
 נתן $\nu \alpha \theta \alpha \nu$ G Ezra 8.16; o Ps. 46.7; nathan On in
 Jonathan, Ju. 18.30.
 נתתה $\nu \alpha \theta \alpha \theta$ o Ps. 18.41.
 וְנָתַן $\sigma \upsilon \iota \epsilon \theta \theta \epsilon \nu$ o Ps. 18.33.
 וְנָתַן $\sigma \upsilon \theta \epsilon \theta \theta \epsilon \nu$ o Ps. 18.36.
 וְנָתַן $\epsilon \theta \nu \eta \sigma \upsilon$ o Ps. 89.28.
 וְנָתַן $\alpha \nu \nu \omega \theta \eta \nu$ o Ps. 18.48.

ד

- סבב $\iota \sigma \omega \beta \alpha \beta \epsilon \nu \nu \sigma$ o Ps. 32.10.
 וְסָבַב $\theta \iota \sigma \omega \beta \alpha \beta \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 32.7.
 וְסָבַב $\iota \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \sigma \upsilon \nu \iota$ o Ps. 49.6; MT: וְסָבַב.
 סבב a) $sabac$ On Gen. 22.13.
 b) $\sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon \kappa$ A ib.; sabech J ib.
 סגלה sgolla J Mal. 3.17.
 סגר $\epsilon \sigma \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \alpha \nu \iota$ o Ps. 31.9.
 סוד a) $\beta \alpha \sigma \omega \delta$ A in Βασωδια, Neh. 3.6; basod
 J Jer. 23.18.
 סודי sodi On Num. 13.10.
 b) $\sigma \sigma \upsilon \delta \epsilon \iota$ B ib.; $\sigma \sigma \upsilon \delta \iota$ A ib.
 סוס sus J Isa. 38.14.
 כסוס $\chi \iota \sigma \sigma \upsilon \varsigma$ o Ps. 32.9.
 כסוי $\sigma \sigma \upsilon \sigma \epsilon \iota$ B Num. 13.11; $\sigma \sigma \upsilon \sigma \iota$ A ib.; susi
 On ib.

- סופה basupha J Nah. 1.3.
 סיג sig J Ezek. 22.18.
 סיגים sigim J Isa. 1.22.
 סינים sinim J Isa. 49.12.
 סיס sis J Isa. 38.14.
 סכה βσοχχα o Ps. 31.21: BCXXA lege BCOXXA;
 cf. Thompson Facs. 4 and 7 (C—O).
 סכח σοκχωθ G Num. 33.5; socchoth On
 Ex. 12.37.
 socoth On Gen. 33.17; sochoth J ib.; Amos
 5.26; MT: סכוח.
 סכן socen J Isa. 22.15.
 סכן amsuchan J Isa. 40.20.
 סלה a) σελα o Ps. 32.7; sela J Hab. 3.3.
 b) σελ o Ps. 3.3.
 סלע σελεי o Ps. 31.4; cf. in the BV סלע' ib. 42.10
 in Ms. Ec 1.
 סמך σαμαχ A in Αχισαμαχ, Ex. 35.34; σαμακ B
 in Αχισαμακ, ib.
 סמוך samuch J Isa. 26.3.
 סנא ασανουα A 1 Chron. 9.7.
 סעד σεσαδηνι o Ps. 18.36: ΘΕCΔΗNI lege
 ΘΕCΑΔΗNI.
 סף seph J Ezek. 40.6.
 ספר sopher J Isa. 36.3.
 ספּר sapharad J Obad. 20.
 סריס σαρεις A in Ραβσαρεις, 2 Ki. 18.17; saris On in
 Rabsaris, ib.
 סרפד sarphod J Isa. 55.13.
 סתר σεθρ o Ps. 32.7.
 בסתר βσεθρ o Ps. 31.21.
 סתרי σεθρι A Ex. 6.22; sethri On ib.
 σετρι B ib.: CEFPI lege T for Γ; cf. Thompson
 Facs. 3.
 סתר הסתר εσθερθα o Ps. 30.8.
 תסתיר θεσθερ o Ps. 89.47; MT: תסתיר.
 תסתירם θεσθειρημ o Ps. 31.21.
 סחור σαθουσρ G Num. 13.13; MT: סחור.

y

- עָבַד a) $\alpha \beta \delta$ G in $A\beta\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\chi$, Jer. 38.7.
 לָעָבַד $\lambda \alpha \alpha \beta \delta$ o Ps. 36.1.
 עָבַדִי $\alpha \beta \delta \epsilon \iota$ B 1 Chron. 6.29; $\alpha \beta \delta \iota$ A ib.
 עָבַדְךָ $\alpha \beta \delta \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 89.40.
 עָבְדוּ $\alpha \beta \delta \omega$ o Ps. 35.27.
 עָבַדִי $\alpha \beta \delta \eta$ A in $A\beta\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon\lambda\mu\alpha$, Ezra 2.58; o Ps. 113.1.
 עָבַדְיָךְ $\alpha \beta \delta \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 89.51; cf. in the PV עָבְדִיךָ Ps. 90.13
 (MdWI, p. א).
 b) עָבַד $\alpha \beta \epsilon \delta$ A Ju. 9.26; a b e d On ib.; cf. B-L.
 §20 m.
- עָבַד עוֹבַד $\omega \beta \eta \delta$ G Ruth 4.17; o b e t h On ib.
 עָבַר a) $\epsilon \beta \epsilon \rho$ A Gen. 10.21; e b e r On ib.
 b) עָבָרִים $\alpha \beta \alpha \rho \epsilon \iota \mu$ G Num. 33.47; a b a r i m On ib.
 מְעָבָרִים m e a b a r i m J Jer. 22.20.
- עָבַר עֲבָרְתִי a b a r t h i J Hos. 10.11.
 אֶעְבֹּר e e b o r J Amos 5.17.
 עָבְרִי $\omega \beta \rho \eta$ o Ps. 89.42.
 הִתְעַבְרָתָּ $\epsilon \vartheta \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \rho \vartheta$ o Ps. 89.39.
- עָבְרָה e b r a t h J Amos 1.11.
 עָבְרוּ בְּעָבְרוֹתָּ $\beta \epsilon \gamma \alpha \beta \rho \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 7.7.
 עָבְרִי i b r i J Gen. 14.13.
 הָעֲבָרִים a h e b r i m On Ex. 2.6; on the h see para-
 graph X.
 עֲבָרִיּוֹת e b r i o t h On Ex. 1.16.
- עָגוּר a) a g o r J Isa. 38.14.
 b) a g u r J ib.
- עָגְלָה a) $\alpha \gamma \lambda \alpha$ A 1 Chron. 3.3.
 b) e g l a J Hos. 10.11.
- עָגְלוֹת $\alpha \gamma \alpha \lambda \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 46.10.
- עָד a) $\alpha \delta$ o Ps. 89.47.
 b) $\epsilon \delta$ o Ps. 18.38.
 לָעָד l a e d J Mic. 7.18.
- עָד וְעָד $\omega \upsilon \eta \delta$ o Ps. 89.38.
- עָדָד עוֹדָד $\omega \delta \eta \delta$ B 2 Chron. 15.1.
- עָדִים e d d i m J Isa. 64.5.
- עָדִי עָדִיו $\alpha \delta \iota \omega$ o Ps. 32.9.

- עֶדֶן $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \nu$ A Gen. 2.8; $e \delta e n$ On ib.
- עֶדֶר a) $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \rho$ A 1 Chron. 23.23.
b) $a d e r$ On Gen. 35.21.
- עוֹד $\omega \delta o$ Ps. 49.10.
- עוֹלָם a) $\lambda \omega \lambda \alpha \mu o$ Ps. 30.7; $l o l a m j$ Ezek. 26.21.
הָעוֹלָם $a \omega \lambda a \mu o$ Ps. 28.9.
b) $\omega \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon \iota \mu o$ Isa. 26.4.
- עוֹן $a \omega \nu o$ Ps. 49.6.
עֲוֹן $a u \nu a \nu o$ Ps. 89.33; perhaps to be explained as an amalgamation of two readings: $a u n a \nu$ (cf. אֲוֵן $a u n a \nu$) + $\omega n a \nu$ cf. on מעמו; $o n a m j$ Zech. 5.6.
- עוֹר הָעֵרֶה $a i \rho a o$ Ps. 35.23.
- עוֹרֶב $\omega \rho \eta \beta$ G Ju. 7.25; $o r e b$ On ib.
- עוֹרְבִים $o r b i m j$ Isa. 15.7.
- עוֹז $o \zeta o$ Ps. 28.8.
עֹז $o \zeta e i$ G in $O \zeta e i \eta \lambda$, Ex. 6.18; o Ps. 28.7; cf. עֹז Ex. 15.2; further in the BV: עֹז Ps. 63.3; עֹז Prov. 10.15 in Ms. Ec 1; $o z i$ On in $O z i h e l$, Ex. 6.18.
- עוֹז $a s$ B in $A \sigma \gamma a \delta$, Ezra 2.12; $a \zeta$ A in $A \zeta \gamma a \delta$, Ezra 8.12.
- עוֹב וְעוֹבֵי $o u a \zeta \beta o u o$ Ps. 49.11.
יְעוֹבֵי $i e \zeta e \beta o u o$ Ps. 89.31.
עוֹבָה $a \zeta o u \beta a$ A 1 Ki. 22.42; $a z u b a$ On ib.
- עוֹר a) $\epsilon \zeta \rho o$ Ps. 46.2; MT: עוֹרָה.
עוֹרִי $\epsilon \zeta \rho i$ A Ju. 6.11; $e z r i$ On ib.; $\epsilon \sigma \delta \rho e i$ B ib.
עוֹרָה וְעוֹרָה $o u e \zeta \rho a o$ Ps. 46.6; MT: עוֹרָה.
b) עוֹר $\epsilon \zeta e \rho$ G in $A \beta i e \zeta e \rho$, Ju. 6.34.
- עוֹר $a \zeta a \rho$ G in $E \lambda e a \zeta a \rho$, Ex. 6.23; $a z a r$ On in $E l e a z a r$, ib.
- עוֹר $\omega \zeta \eta \rho o$ Ps. 30.11.
עוֹר $a z u r$ On Ezek. 11.1; MT: עוֹר.
עוֹרִי וְעוֹרִי $o u n e \zeta a \rho \theta i o$ Ps. 28.7; $o u n a \zeta e \rho \theta i$ lege $o u n e \zeta a \rho \theta i$.
- עוֹרָה בְּעוֹרָתִי $\beta a e \zeta \rho a \theta i o$ Ps. 35.2.
- עוֹרָה $a z a r a j$ Ezek. 43.17.
- עֶטָה הָעֶטָתָה $\epsilon e \tau \eta \theta o$ Ps. 89.46.
- עֶטָרָה $a \tau a \rho a$ B 1 Chron. 2.26.
- עֶטָרוֹת $a \tau a \rho \omega \theta$ G Num. 32.3; $a t a r o t h$ On ib.

- עין a) $\alpha \iota \nu$ A Josh. 19.7; o Ps. 35.9; a i n On Num. 34.11.
 b) $\eta \nu$ A in $\text{H}\nu\alpha\delta\delta\alpha$, Josh. 19.21; e n On in En-
 adda, ib.
 עיני $\eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 31.10.
 עיניו $\eta \nu \eta \nu \sigma \upsilon$ o Ps. 35.21.
 עינם e n a m j Zech. 5.6.
 עינים e n a i m On Gen. 38.21.
 ועינים $\sigma \upsilon \eta \nu \alpha \iota \mu$ o Ps. 18.28: OTNNAIM lege H for
 the first N; cf. Thompson Facs. 5.
 עינך $\eta \nu \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 31.23.
 עיניו $\eta \nu \alpha \upsilon$ o Ps. 36.2.
 בעיניו $\beta \eta \eta \nu \alpha \upsilon$ o Ps. 36.3: BHNNAT lege H for the
 first N; cf. Thompson Facs. 5.
 עיר $\iota \rho$ o Ps. 46.5; i r j Isa. 26.5.
 בעיר $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \iota \rho$ o Ps. 31.22.
 העיר $\alpha \epsilon \iota \rho$ o Gen. 28.19.
 עירם i r a m On Gen. 36.43.
 ערים a r i m j Isa. 14.21.
 על $\alpha \lambda$ o Ps. 8.1; a l j Hab. 3.1.
 ועל $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \lambda$ o Ps. 18.34.
 עלי $\alpha \lambda \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 35.21.
 עליך $\alpha \lambda \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 32.28.
 עליו $\alpha \lambda \alpha \upsilon \iota$ o Ps. 89.46.
 ועליה $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \lambda \epsilon \alpha$ o Ps. 7.8.
 עליהם a l e h e m j Zech. 14.17.
 עלה $\epsilon \epsilon \lambda \theta$ o Ps. 30.4; perhaps to be corrected to
 $\epsilon \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta$; cf. §53a β .
 עלי $\alpha \lambda \eta$ o Ps. 49.12; $\alpha \lambda \epsilon$ o Ps. 92.4 (1°).
 ועלי $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \lambda \epsilon$ o Ps. 92.4.
 עלה a l e j Ezek. 47.12.
 עלומים $\alpha \lambda \sigma \upsilon \mu \alpha \upsilon$ o Ps. 89.46.
 עליון $\epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \nu$ o Ps. 46.5; e l i o n j Isa. 2.22.
 עליל $\beta \alpha \alpha \lambda \iota \lambda$ o Ps. 12.7.
 עלם n a a l m a j Job 28.21.
 העלים e e l i m j 2 Ki. 4.27 (vol. IV, p. 109 B).
 עלמה a l m a j Isa. 7.14.
 עלמות $\alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \theta$ j Ps. 9.1 (on Isa. 7.14); MT: על מות.
 עלמות $\alpha \lambda \mu \omega \theta$ o Ps. 46.1; MT: עלמות.

- עם $\epsilon \mu$ O Ps. 18.26.
 מעמו $\mu \eta \epsilon \mu \omega \alpha \nu$ O Ps. 89.34; perhaps originating
 in the combination of two separate readings:
 $\mu \eta \epsilon \mu \omega + \mu \eta \epsilon \mu \alpha \nu$; cf. on $\eta \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}$ and on $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota}$.
 עמו $\epsilon \mu \alpha \nu \sigma \upsilon$ G in Εμμανουηλ , Isa. 7.14; O Ps. 46.8;
 e m m a n u On in Emmanuhel, Isa. 7.14.
- עם a) $\alpha \mu$ O Ps. 18.28; a m On in Amram, Ex. 6.18.
 בעם $\beta \alpha \alpha \mu$ O Ps. 35.18.
 עמי $\alpha \mu \epsilon \iota$ B in Αμειναδαβ , Num. 1.7; $\alpha \mu \iota$ A in
 Αμιναδαβ , ib.; a m i On in Aminadab, ib.
 עמים $\alpha \mu \iota \mu$ O Ps. 89.51.
 העמים $\alpha \alpha \mu \iota \mu$ O Ps. 49.2: AAMIN lege M for N.
 b) עמי a m m i On in Ammiad, 2 Sam. 13.37.
 עך $\alpha \mu \mu \alpha \chi$ O Ps. 28.9.
 עמים $\alpha \mu \mu \iota \mu$ O Ps. 18.48: AMIMIM lege AMMIM.
- עמד העמד $\epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \theta$ O Ps. 31.9.
 עמדי $\iota \epsilon \mu \iota \delta \eta \nu \iota$ O Ps. 18.34.
- עמוד עמודה $\alpha \mu \sigma \upsilon \delta \alpha$ O Ps. 75.4; MT: עמדיה.
- עמית עמיתי a m i t h i J Zech. 13.7.
- עקם e m e c On Josh. 17.16.
 העקם $\alpha \epsilon \mu \epsilon \kappa$ A in Βηθαεμεκ , Josh. 19.27.
- ענה $\alpha \nu \alpha$ A Gen. 36.14; MT: ענה; a n a On ib.
 ענה $\alpha \nu \alpha \mu$ O Ps. 18.42.
 ענה $\alpha \nu \alpha \theta \alpha$ J Hos. 2.17.
 עניתי $\epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \iota$ O Ps. 35.13.
 קעונים $\mu \sigma \sigma \upsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \mu$ A Ezra 2.50.
- ענוה ענוהך $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \chi$ O Ps. 18.36; perhaps to be
 corrected to: $\sigma \upsilon \alpha \nu \sigma \upsilon \alpha \theta \alpha \chi$.
- עני $\alpha \nu \iota$ O Ps. 18.28.
 עני $\alpha \nu \iota \eta$ O Ps. 76.10; MT: עני; a n i e J Zech. 11.11.
- עני עני $\sigma \upsilon \nu$ O Ps. 31.8; perhaps to be corrected to $\sigma \upsilon \nu$;
 haplography; the following word $\iota \alpha \delta \alpha \theta$ begins with
 ι , too.
- ענין a n i a n J Eccl. 1.13.
- ענה $\sigma \nu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ J Isa. 57.3.
- עקם $\epsilon \nu \alpha \kappa$ A Num. 13.22; $\epsilon \nu \alpha \chi$ B ib.
 ענקים $\epsilon \nu \alpha \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu$ G Deut. 2.10.
 a n a c i m On ib.: anacin, lege m for the second n.

- עפף m o p h e p h j Isa. 14.29.
 עפר α φ α ρ o Ps. 30.10; a p h a r j Gen. 3.14; a f a r j ib.,
 ed. Lagarde.
 עפף χ α α φ α ρ o Ps. 18.43.
 עפרה a f a r a On Josh. 18.23; MT: עפרה.
 עפדים α σ ε β ε ι ν o Ps. 127.2; MT: עפדים.
 עצה β η σ α θ o Ps. 1.1; cf. in the PV ועצח Isa. 44.26
 (MdWI, p. 7).
 עצם α σ ο υ μ o Ps. 35.18.
 עצרה a s a r a j Joel 1.14.
 עקב a) עקבות ε κ β ω θ o Ps. 89.52.
 b) עקב e c e b j Amos 4.12.
 עקב ι α κ ω β G Gen. 25.26; i a c o b On ib.
 עקבי α κ ο β β α ι o Ps. 49.6; MT: עקבי; cf. Hos. 6.8.
 עקרב a) עקרבים α κ ρ α β ε ι μ B Josh. 15.3: Ακραβειν lege
 μ for ν.
 b) α κ ρ α β β ε ι μ A ib.; a c r a b b i m On ib.
 עקש ε κ κ η σ o Ps. 18.27.
 עקש ε κ κ η σ A 1 Chron. 11.28.
 ער η ρ A Gen. 38.3; e r On ib.
 ערב a) ערב β α α ρ β o Ps. 30.6.
 b) ערב a r a b j Isa. 21.13.
 ערבה α ρ α β α B in Βαιθαβαβα, Josh. 15.6; a r a b a On
 Deut. 1.7.
 ערבוח α ρ α β ω θ G Num. 26.63; a r a b o t h On ib.
 ערבי a r a b e j Jer. 3.2.
 ערבim a r a b i m j Isa. 15.7.
 ערום a r o m j Gen. 3.1.
 ערירי a r i r i j Jer. 22.29.
 ערף ο ρ φ o Ps. 18.41.
 ערש a r e s j Amos 3.12.
 עש a s j Hos. 5.12.
 עשה α σ α G in Ασαηλ, 2 Sam. 23.24; a s a On in Asahel, ib.
 העשו θ ε σ ο υ o Mal. 2.13.
 עשה ω σ η o Ps. 31.24.
 עשור α σ ω ρ o Ps. 92.4.
 עשיר α σ ι ρ o Ps. 49.3; CIP lege AC IP; haplography (IAAΔ
 CIP; Δ—A).

- עָשָׂן *a s a n* A 1 Sam. 30.30; *a s a n* On Josh. 19.7.
 עָשָׂר *o s r a m o* Ps. 49.7.
 עֶשְׂרֶה *es re* J Ezek. 40.49.
 עֵשֶׂשׁ *a s s a o* Ps. 31.10.
 עֶשְׂתִּי *aste* J Ezek. 40.49.

פ

- פָּאֵחַ *f a t h* On Lev. 19.9.
 פְּחֻרָה *ph u r a* J Isa. 10.33.
 פָּגָרִים *ph a g a r i m* J Jer. 31.40; cf. in the BV פְּגָרִי Lev. 26.30 in Ms. Ea 13.
 פָּדָה *φ α δ α* G in Φαδαηλ, Num. 34.28; *f a d a* On in Fadaia, 2 Ki. 23.36.
 פָּדִיתָ *φ α δ ι τ* o Ps. 31.6: ΦΑΛΙΘ, lege Δ for Λ.
 פָּדָה *ι ε φ δ ε* o Ps. 49.8: ΙΕΦΑΕ, lege Δ for Α.
 פָּדָה *φ α δ ω* o Ps. 49.8.
 פָּדִיוֹן *φ ε δ ι ω ν* o Ps. 49.9.
 פֶּה *st. constr. פִּי φ ι* A in Φικολ, Gen. 21.22; *fi* On in Fichol, ib.
 פִּי *φ ι* o Ps. 49.4.
 פִּיָּם *φ ι ε μ* o Ps. 35.21.
 פִּיָּם *β α φ ι ε μ* o Ps. 49.14.
 פִּיךָ *b a p h p h u c h* J Isa. 54.11.
 פֹּעַ *ι α φ ι ε* A Josh. 10.3; ε is the transliteration of the *y*, cf. paragraph XXIII sub *y*; *ia fie* On ib.
 פֹּר *α φ ι ρ* o Ps. 89.34.
 פֹּרָה *ph u r a* J Isa. 63.3.
 פֹּה *φ α ς* B in Ελειφας, 1 Chron. 1.35.
φ α ς A in Ελιφαζ, ib.; *ph a z* J Isa. 13.12; *f a z* On in Elifaz, Gen. 36.4.
 פָּחַד *π α α δ* G in Σαλπααδ, Num. 26.33.
φ α α δ o Ps. 36.2; *f a a t h* On in Salfaath, Num. 26.33.
 פָּחַח *φ α α θ* A in Φααθμωαβ, Ezra 10.30.
φ α α δ B in Φααδμωαβ, ib.
 פָּחוּ *ph o e z i m* J Zeph. 3.4.
 פֶּלֶא *ph e l e* J Isa. 9.5.
 פֶּלֶא *ε φ λ ι* o Ps. 31.22.

- פֶּלֶג a) fa leg On Gen. 10.25; φαλεκ A ib.; φαλεχ B 1 Chron. 1.25.
 ב) פֶּלְגִי φαλαγαν vel φαγαν o Ps. 46.5 (H-R.).
 פֶּלֶט φαλητ o Ps. 32.7; without gemination of the 2nd radical; cf. on פֶּלֶט.
 פֶּלֶטִי φαλετηνι o Ps. 31.2.
 פֶּלִיטָה a) phaleta J Joel 3.5.
 ב) פֶּלִיטִים pheletim J Obad. 17.
 פֶּנֶג phanag J Ezek. 27.17.
 פֶּנֶה לִפְנוֹת λανωθ o Ps. 46.6: ΛΦΝΩΘ lege ΛΑΦΝΩΘ.
 פֶּנוֹת φεννωθ o Mal. 2.13; MT: פֶּנוֹת.
 פֶּנֶה ιεφοννη G Num. 13.7.
 פֶּנִים פֶּנִי φανη o Ps. 18.43.
 פֶּנִי φαναχ o Ps. 30.8.
 פֶּנִי phanau J Isa. 6.2.
 פֶּסֶח phase J Ezek. 25.15.
 פֶּסֶח θαψα A 1 Ki. 5.4.
 פֶּעַל phalach J Hab. 3.2.
 פֶּעַל φαλα A in Ελφααλ, 1 Chron. 8.18.
 פֶּעַל φαλαθα o Ps. 31.20.
 פֶּקֶד פֶּקֶדֶת ουθακαδθι o Ps. 89.33: ουφαδθι lege ουφακαδθι.
 פֶּקֶד phacud J Ezek. 23.23; MT: פֶּקֶד.
 פֶּר phar J Ezek. 43.23.
 פֶּרִים pharim J Hos. 14.3.
 פֶּרָא phara J Gen. 16.12; fara J ib., ed. Lagarde.
 פֶּרֶד כֶּפֶרֶד χφαρδ o Ps. 32.9.
 פֶּרֶה φαρα B Josh. 18.23.
 פֶּרֶה affara On ib.
 פֶּרֶח φαρρου A 1 Ki. 4.17.
 פֶּרִי pheri J Hos. 14.3.
 פֶּרִיִּי pharis J Ezek. 18.10.
 פֶּרֶץ a) φαρες A Gen. 38.29; fares On ib.
 ב) pheres J Isa. 58.12.
 ב) פֶּרָצִים φαρασειμ A in Βααλφαρασειν, lege μ for ν, 1 Chron. 14.11; pharasim J Isa. 28.27.
 פֶּרֶץ φαρασθ o Ps. 89.41.
 פֶּרֶק pherec J Nah. 3.1.
 פֶּרֶש phares J Mal. 2.3.

- פֶּשַׁע $\varphi \epsilon \sigma \alpha$ o Ps. 36.2.
 פֶּשַׁעִם $\varphi \epsilon \sigma \alpha \mu$ o Ps. 89.33: $\Phi \epsilon \text{CAM}$ lege $\Phi \epsilon \text{CAM}$.
 פֹּתָהּ $p h o t h a$ J Mic. 7.11.
 פִּתְּחֶיהָ $b a p h e t h e e$ J Mic. 5.5.
 פִּתּוּחַ $p h e t e e$ J Zech. 3.9.
 פִּתַּח $\pi \alpha \vartheta \alpha$ B in $\pi \alpha \vartheta \alpha \iota \alpha$, Neh. 11.24.
 $\varphi \alpha \vartheta \alpha$ A in $\Phi \alpha \vartheta \alpha \iota \alpha$, ib.
 יִפְתָּה $\iota \epsilon \varphi \vartheta \alpha$ A Josh. 15.43; $\iota \epsilon \varphi \vartheta \alpha \epsilon$ G Ju. 11.14;
 the second $\epsilon = \eta$, cf. paragraph XXIII sub η ;
 iep te On Josh. 15.43.
 מִפְּתָח $\epsilon \varphi \vartheta \alpha$ o Ps. 49.5.
 מִפְּתָחַם $m a p h a t e$ J Zech. 3.9.
 פִּתְּחֶיהָ $\varphi \epsilon \vartheta \epsilon \vartheta \alpha$ o Ps. 30.12; without gemination of
 the 2nd radical; cf. on פִּתְּחֶיהָ.
 פְּתִיגִי $p h t h i g a l$ J Isa. 3.24.
 פִּתְּלִי $n e p h t h a l e t h i$ J Gen. 30.8; $n e p t a l t i$
 J ib., ed. Lagarde.
 תִּפְתַּל $\vartheta \epsilon \vartheta \varphi \alpha \vartheta \vartheta \alpha \lambda$ o Ps. 18.27.

צ

- צֹא $s o a$ J in $c i s o a$, Isa. 28.8.
 צֹאן $\chi \alpha \sigma \omega \nu$ o Ps. 49.15.
 צִסְאִים $s a s a i m$ J Isa. 22.24.
 צָבָאוֹת $\sigma \alpha \beta \alpha \omega \vartheta$ G 1 Sam. 1.3; o Ps. 46.8; $s a b a o t h$ On
 1 Sam. 1.3.
 צָבִי $s a b a i$ J Dan. 11.41.
 צֶדֶה $s e d a$ J Gen. 45.21.
 צָדִיק a) $\sigma \alpha \delta \iota \kappa$ o Isa. 26.2.
 b) צְדִיקִים $\sigma \alpha \delta \delta \iota \kappa \iota \mu$ o Ps. 32.11.
 צֶדֶק a) $\sigma \epsilon \delta \kappa \iota$ o Ps. 35.27.
 צָדֶק $\sigma \epsilon \delta \kappa \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 35.28.
 צָדֶקֶךָ $\chi \sigma \epsilon \delta \kappa \alpha \chi$ o Ps. 35.24: $X C E \Delta K A \Delta$ lege X for
 second Δ ; for some resemblance cf. Thompson
 Facs. 18.
 b) צֶדֶק $\sigma \epsilon \delta \epsilon \kappa$ A in $M \epsilon \lambda \chi \iota \sigma \epsilon \delta \epsilon \kappa$, Gen. 14.18; $s e d e c$
 On in $M e l c h i s e d e c$, ib.
 אֲסֶדֶק $a s e d e c$ J Isa. 19.18.

- צדקנן *sadecenu* J Jer. 23.6; MT: צדקנן; but cf. in the BV צדקי Job 35.2 in Ms. Ec 1, for MT צדקי.
- צדקה a) *βσεδκαϑαχ* o Ps. 31.2.
b) *sadaca* J Isa. 5.7.
- צהר *ισααρ* A Ex. 6.18; MT: יצהר; *isaar* J Zech. 4.14.
iessaar On Ex. 6.18.
- צו *sa* u J Isa. 28.10; cf. B-L. §17z.
lasau J ib.
- צור *sud* J Hos. 9.13.
- צום *βασωμ* o Ps. 35.13.
- צוף *σ ου φ* G 1 Chron. 6.20.
- צור a) *σ ου ρ* G Num. 25.15; o Ps. 18.32; *sur* J Isa. 10.26.
b) *σ ου ρ ει* B in *Σουρεισάδαι*, Num. 1.6; *σ ου ρ ι* A in *Σουρισαδαι*, ib.; o Ps. 18.47; *suri* On in *Surisaddai*, Num. 1.6.
ουσορραμ o Ps. 49.15.
b) *σ ω ρ* o Isa. 26.4.
sori On in *Sorihel*, Num. 3.35.
- צחק *ισαακ* G Gen. 21.3; *isaac* On ib.; MT: יצחק.
- צחור *soor* J Ezek. 27.18.
- צי *siim* J Isa. 13.21.
- ציון *basaion* J Isa. 25.5.
- ציון *sionim* J Jer. 31.21.
- צינק *sinac* J Jer. 29.26.
- ציר *sir* J Obad. 1.
- צל a) *σαλ* G in *Σαλπααδ*, Num. 26.33; cf. in the BV זל Job 8.9 in Ms. Ec 1; *sal* On in *Salfaath*, Num. 26.33; cf. B-L. §14z and g'.
b) *βσεελ* G in *Βεσελεηλ*, Ex. 31.2; *besel* On in *Beselehel*, ib.
sela On Gen. 4.19; MT: זל; cf. Jerome's explanation: *umbra eius*.
σελλα A ib.
- צלח *ασλιαννα* o Ps. 118.25.
- צלע *ουβσαλη* o Ps. 35.15.
- צלצל *selsel* J Isa. 18.1.
- צמה *semmathech* J Isa. 47.2.
samthech J ib.

- צמח *sema* j Zech. 6.12.
 צמת *ασμιθαυμ* o Ps. 18.41.
 צנה a) *σενα* A Josh. 15.3.
 b) *σεννα* B ib.: CENNAK dele K, dittography.
 c) *σουσεννα* o Ps. 35.2.
 צנוח *sannoth* j Amos 4.2.
 צניף *saniph* j Zech. 8.5.
 צנע *esne* j Mic. 6.8.
 צנחר *sinthoroth* j Zech. 4.12.
 צעד *σααδαι* o Ps. 18.37; MT: צעדי.
 צעקה *saaca* j Isa. 5.7.
 צפה *σωφίμ* A 1 Sam. 1.1; *sofim* On ib.
 צפון *σαφων* B Num. 26.15; MT: צפון; *saphon* j Jer. 25.26.
 צפוני *σαφωνει* B Num. 26.15; *σαφωνι* A ib.
 צפור *σепφωρ* G Num. 22.2; *sefor* On ib.
 צפיעות *sephoth* j Isa. 22.24.
 צפירה *sephphira* j Ezek. 7.10.
 צפן *σαφαν* G in *Ελειαφαν*, Num. 3.30.
 צפנה *σαφανθα* o Ps. 31.20.
 הצפנים *θισφνημ* o Ps. 31.21.
 צפון *σαφουτ* o Ps. 48.3; MT: צפון.
 צפען *saphphonim* j Jer. 8.17.
 צר *σαρ* o Ps. 31.10; *sar* j Amos 3.11.
 מצר *μεσσαρ* o Ps. 32.7.
 צריו *σαραυι* o Ps. 89.43.
 צרה *βσαρωθ* o Ps. 31.8; 46.2.
 צרע *σαρουα* A 1 Ki. 11.26.
 צרעה *sarath* j Gen. 17.16.
 צרף *σερουφα* o Ps. 18.31.

ק

- קבע *hajecca* j Mal. 3.8.
 קדים *cadim* j Ezek. 27.26.
 קדם *κεδεμ* G Ezek. 25.4; *cedem* j ib.
 מקדם *mecedem* j Gen. 2.8.
 קדמה *κεδμα* A Gen. 25.15; *cedma* On ib.
 קדש *κοδς* o Ps. 46.5.

- קדש a) $\kappa \omicron \delta \varsigma$ o Ps. 29.2.
 שדקדש $\beta \epsilon \kappa \omicron \delta \varsigma$ o Ps. 89.36; MT: שדקדש.
 שדקדש $\kappa \omicron \delta \sigma \omega$ o Ps. 30.5: $\text{KO}\Delta\text{E}\Omega$ lege C for ϵ .
 שדקדש codsa j Isa. 40.13.
 b) שדק codes j Isa. 52.1.
 שדק cadeso j Isa. 63.10; cf. in the PV שדק Ps. 105.42 (Edelmann, p. 7, line 8).
 c) שדקדש $\alpha \kappa \kappa \omicron \delta \alpha \sigma \iota \mu$ o 2 Ki. 23.7; MT: שדקדש.
 שדק $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \varsigma$ A Gen. 14.7; cades On ib.
 שדקדש $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \mu$ B 2 Ki. 23.7; $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma \iota \mu$ A ib.:
 $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ lege μ for ν ; cadesim On ib.
 שדקדש cadesa j Isa. 27.1.
 שדקדש cadesoth j Hos. 4.14.
 קהל $\beta \alpha \kappa \alpha \alpha \lambda$ o Ps. 35.18.
 קהל coeleth j Eccl. 1.1.
 קו cau j Isa. 28.10; cf. B-L. §17z.
 לקו lacau j ib.
 קול $\kappa \omega \lambda$ A in $\text{K}\omega\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$, Neh. 11.7; o Ps. 28.6.
 וקול $\beta \kappa \omega \lambda \omega$ o Ps. 46.7.
 קום $\kappa \alpha \mu$ G in $\text{A}\delta \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \mu$, Ezra 8.13; cam On in
 Ahicam , 2 Ki. 22.12.
 קום jaccum j Nah. 1.6.
 קמי $\kappa \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 18.40.
 קום $\omicron \upsilon \kappa \omicron \upsilon \mu$ o Ps. 35.2; MT: קמי.
 קום $\kappa \omicron \upsilon \mu$ o Ps. 18.39.
 וקום $\alpha \kappa \iota \mu \omega \theta \omega$ o Ps. 89.44.
 קום $\iota \alpha \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu$ G 1 Chron. 8.19; iacim On in Eliacim
 2 Ki. 18.18.
 קיץ $\kappa \omega \varsigma$ G 1 Chron. 24.10.
 קיץ a) $\alpha \kappa \omega \varsigma$ B Neh. 3.4.
 b) $\alpha \kappa \kappa \omega \varsigma$ A ib.
 קיץ $\omicron \upsilon \alpha \kappa \iota \sigma \alpha$ o Ps. 35.23.
 קטן a) $\alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu$ B Ezra 8.12.
 b) $\alpha \kappa \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu$ A ib.
 קי ci j in cisoa , Isa. 28.8.
 קיט citor j Gen. 19.28.
 קינ $\kappa \iota \nu \alpha$ A Josh. 15.22.
 קיני ciceion j Jonah 4.6.

- קיר *cir* J Isa. 38.2.
 קלל קלוֹת *calloth* J Nah. 1.14.
 קלע קולע *colea* J Jer. 10.18.
 קנאָה *cena* J Ezek. 8.3.
 קנה *cane* J Jer. 6.20.
 קנה *κα να* G in *Ελκανα*, Ex. 6.24; *cana* On in *Elcana*, ib.
 קנני *canani* J Prov. 8.22.
 קניתי *canithi* J Gen. 4.1.
 קסח *cesath* J Ezek. 9.2.
 קצה קצה *κα σ ε ο* Ps. 46.9.
 קצין *κα σ ι ν* A Josh. 19.13: *κασιμ* *lege ν* for *μ*; *casin*
 On ib.: *casim lege n* for *m*.
 קצץ קצץ *ο υ κ ε σ σ η ς ο* Ps. 46.10: *ΟΤΚ.ССНC lege*
ΟΤΚΕCCHC.
 קצר הקצר *ε κ σ ε ρ θ ο* Ps. 89.46.
 קרא קראת *carath* J Jer. 3.12.
 קראתי *κα ρ α θ ι ο* Hos. 11.1; *carathi* J Isa. 7.14;
 MT: קראח.
 וקרא *ο υ κ ι ρ α ο* Lev. 1.1.
 וקראני *ι κ ρ α η ν ι ο* Ps. 89.27.
 אקרא *ε κ ρ α ο* Ps. 30.9.
 קורא *κ ω ρ η G* 2 Chron. 31.14.
 קראו *κ ε ρ ο υ ο* Ps. 49.12; MT: קראו.
 קרב a) בקרב *β ε κ ο ρ β ο* Ps. 36.2.
 b) בקרבה *β κ ε ρ β α ο* Ps. 46.6.
 c) קרבם *κα ρ β α μ ο* Ps. 49.12.
 d) בקרב *bacereb* J Hab. 3.2.
 קרב קרב *κα ρ ω β ο* Ps. 32.9: *ΚΑΡΩΘ lege B* for *Θ*; MT: קרב.
 קריה *caria* J Isa. 26.5.
 קריה *κα ρ ι α θ G* in *Καριαθβααλ*, Josh. 15.60; *car-*
iath J Hos. 2.15.
 קרייתם *κα ρ ι α θ α ι μ Α* Jer. 48.1; *cariathaim*
 On Num. 32.37.
 קריית *carioth* On Jer. 48.24.
 הקריית *α κ κ α ρ ι ω θ Α* Jer. 48.41.
 קרן קרנים *κα ρ ν α ι μ Α* Gen. 14.5: *καρναιν lege μ* for
 second *ν*; *carnaim* On ib.

- קרסלים קרסלי $\kappa \rho \sigma \epsilon \lambda \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 18.37: XOPCEΛAI lege K for X; cf. Thompson Facs. 7.
- קרץ ישמעו $\iota \kappa \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \upsilon$ o Ps. 35.19; cf. in the BV יקראו 1 Sam. 13.3; Jer. 23.6 in MdO, p. 185; cf. also Sam. Ex. 21.35: יחיצון for MT: יחצון.
- קשה קשה casa J Isa. 27.1.
- קשת a) $\kappa \alpha \sigma \vartheta$ o Ps. 46.10.
b) $\kappa \epsilon \sigma \vartheta$ o Ps. 18.35.
c) ceseth J Isa. 66.19.

ר

- רָאָה raa J Gen. 32.29; raha J ib., ed. Lagarde.
רָאָה $\rho \alpha \alpha \vartheta \alpha$ o Ps. 35.21.
רָאִיתָ $\rho \alpha \iota \vartheta$ o Ps. 31.8.
רָאִיתָ $\rho \alpha \epsilon \iota \vartheta \alpha$ o Ps. 35.22: PACIΘA lege € for C.
וְרָאִיתִי uraithi J Ezek. 41.8.
רָאוּ rau J Hab. 1.5; MT: ראו.
רָאָה $\iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ o Ps. 89.49.
רָאָה $\vartheta \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ o Ps. 35.17: ΘEPC lege € for C.
רָאוּ $\rho \sigma \upsilon$ A in Πουβην, Gen. 29.32; ru On in Ruben, ib.
- רָאִמוֹת ramoth J Ezek. 27.16.
- רָאָשׁ a) $\rho \omega \varsigma$ G Ezek. 38.3; ros J ib.
הָרָאֵשׁ $\alpha \rho \omega \varsigma$ A 1 Chron. 24.31.
b) ראש rus On Gen. 46.21.
- רָאִשִׁית ראשית $\beta \rho \eta \sigma \iota \vartheta$ o Gen. 1.1; bresith J ib.
- רָאִשׁוֹן ראשון $\alpha \rho \iota \sigma \omega \nu \iota \mu$ o Ps. 89.50.
- רָב a) $\rho \alpha \beta$ A in Παβσαπεις, 2 Ki. 18.17; o Ps. 31.20:
rab On in Rabsaris, 2 Ki. 18.17.
רָבִים $\rho \alpha \beta \iota \mu$ o Ps. 32.6.
b) רבה $\rho \alpha \beta \beta \alpha$ A Josh. 13.25.
רָבָה rabbath On Deut. 3.11.
רָבִים $\rho \alpha \beta \beta \iota \mu$ o Ps. 32.10.
רָבוֹת rabboth On Josh. 19.20; MT: רבית.
רָב וּבָרַב $\sigma \upsilon \epsilon \beta \rho \sigma \beta$ o Ps. 49.7.

- רבה $\vartheta \epsilon \rho \beta \eta \nu \iota$ o Ps. 18.36: $\Theta \epsilon \rho \beta \eta \nu \iota$ lege H for first N; cf. Thompson Facs. 5.
- רגל $\rho \epsilon \gamma \lambda \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 18.34; ib. 31.9: $\epsilon \rho \gamma \lambda \alpha \iota$ lege $\rho \epsilon \gamma \lambda \alpha \iota$; cf. in the BV רגל¹ Ps. 40.3 in Ms. Ec 1.
רגל¹ $\rho \epsilon \gamma \lambda \alpha \upsilon$ j Isa. 6.2; cf. in the BV רגל¹ Ex. 25.26 in Ms. Ea 5.
- רגל $\rho \omega \gamma \eta \lambda$ G Josh. 18.16.
רגל¹ a) $\rho \omega \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu$ A 2 Sam. 17.27.
b) $\rho \omega \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu$ B ib.
- רגע $\rho \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ o Ps. 30.6.
- רגע $\rho \epsilon \gamma \eta$ o Ps. 35.20.
- רדידים $\alpha \rho \delta \iota \delta \iota \mu$ j Isa. 3.23.
- רדף $\epsilon \rho \delta \omicron \varphi$ o Ps. 18.38.
- רהב $\rho \epsilon \epsilon \beta$ j Isa. 30.7.
- רוד $\rho \alpha \delta$ j Hos. 12.1.
- רוח a) $\rho \upsilon \alpha$ j Isa. 40.13. $\rho \upsilon \eta \alpha$ j Eccl. 6.9.
ברוח $\beta \alpha \rho \upsilon \alpha$ j Gen. 3.8, ed. Lagarde; MT: לרוח.
b) לרוח $\lambda \alpha \rho \upsilon \epsilon$ j Gen. 3.8; on the e cf. paragraph XXIII sub ה.
- רוח¹ $\rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \eta$ o Ps. 31.6.
 $\rho \upsilon \eta \iota$ j Ezek. 39.29.
- רום $\omicron \upsilon \iota \alpha \rho \omicron \upsilon \mu$ o Ps. 18.47.
ארום $\alpha \rho \omicron \upsilon \mu$ o Ps. 46.11.
רם $\rho \alpha \mu$ G 1 Chron. 2.9.
רמה $\rho \alpha \mu \alpha$ G Josh. 18.25; $\rho \alpha \mu \alpha$ On ib.
רמות $\rho \alpha \mu \omega \vartheta$ A 1 Ki. 4.13; o Ps. 18.28; $\rho \alpha \mu \omicron \theta$ On 1 Ki. 4.13.
 $\alpha \rho \eta \mu \omega \vartheta$ o Ps. 89.43.
 $\omicron \upsilon \alpha \rho \eta \mu$ o Ps. 28.9; MT: ורעם.
- רוץ $\alpha \rho \omicron \upsilon \varsigma$ o Ps. 18.30.
רצים $\rho \alpha \sigma \epsilon \iota \mu$ A 2 Ki. 11.4.
- רזון $\rho \alpha \zeta \omega \nu$ A 1 Ki. 11.23; MT: רזון; $\rho \alpha \zeta \omega \nu$ On ib.
- רחב $\upsilon \rho \omicron \beta$ j Ezek. 40.49.
- רחב $\vartheta \epsilon \rho \iota \beta$ o Ps. 18.37.
 $\omicron \varsigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \omicron \upsilon$ o Ps. 35.21.
- רחוב $\rho \omicron \omicron \beta \omicron \theta$ On Gen. 10.11.

- רחום $\rho\alpha\sigma\upsilon\mu$ A Neh. 3.17; MT: רָחוּם.
 רַחֵל $\rho\alpha\chi\eta\lambda$ A Gen. 29.6; rachel On ib.
 רחם a) מְרַחֵם $\mu\eta\rho\epsilon\mu$ o Ps. 110.3.
 b) רָחֵם $rehem$ J Amos 1.11.
 מְרַחֵם $merehem$ J Isa. 46.3; MT: מְרַחֵם.
 רחם $\rho\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu$ A 1 Sam. 1.1; ieroam On ib.
 רחף מְרַחֶפֶת $marahaefeth$ J Gen. 1.2, ed. Lagarde.
 merefeth J ib.
 רחק תִּרְחַק $\theta\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa$ o Ps. 35.22.
 ריב רִיבָה $\rho\iota\beta\alpha$ o Ps. 35.1.
 יָרִיב $\iota\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\beta$ A 1 Chron. 4.24; $\iota\alpha\rho\iota\beta$ A in $\iota\omega\iota\alpha\rho\iota\beta$,
 Neh. 11.5; jarib J Hos. 5.13; MT: יָרִיב.
 ריב לָרִיבִי $\lambda\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\iota$ o Ps. 35.23: ΛΕΡΒΙ lege ΛΕΡΙΒΙ;
 haplography I—P; cf. Thompson Facs. 6 and 9.
 מְרִיבִי $\mu\rho\iota\beta\eta$ o Ps. 31.21; MT: מְרִיבִי.
 רַחִיל $rachil$ J Ezek. 22.9.
 רַחֻשׁ $rachus$ J Gen. 14.16.
 רכסי מְרַכְסִי $\mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\chi\sigma\eta$ o Ps. 31.21.
 רָם $\rho\alpha\mu$ G 1 Chron. 2.9.
 רָמָה $\rho\alpha\mu\alpha$ G Josh. 18.25; rama On ib.
 רָמַת $\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\theta$ A Josh. 19.21; MT: רָמַת; ramath On ib.
 רָמַתַּיִם $ramathaim$ On 1 Sam. 1.1.
 רָמַת $\rho\alpha\mu\omega\theta$ G Josh. 21.38; o Ps. 18.28; ramoth
 On Josh. 21.38.
 רַמּוֹן $\rho\epsilon\mu\mu\omega\nu$ G in Γεδερεμμων, Josh. 21.24; remmon
 On in Remmonfares, Num. 33.19.
 רַמֵּם $\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\chi$ o Ps. 30.2.
 רָמֶס $remes$ J Hab. 1.14.
 רָנִי $\rho\alpha\nu\eta$ o Ps. 32.7.
 רָנוּ $\iota\alpha\rho\sigma\nu\sigma\upsilon\sigma$ o Ps. 35.27.
 וְהָרָנוּ $\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\rho\nu\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma$ o Ps. 32.11.
 רָסֵן a) וְרָסֵן $\sigma\upsilon\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\nu$ o Ps. 32.9.
 b) רָסֵן $resen$ J Zech. 14.20.
 רַע $\rho\epsilon$ G in Αχειρε, Num. 1.15; re J Hos. 3.1.
 ree J Gen. 38.12; on the second e (=ע) cf. paragraph
 XXIII sub ע.

- קרע $\chi\rho\eta\epsilon$ o Ps. 35.14.
 רעים reim j Jer. 3.1.
 רע ρa o Ps. 49.6.
 רעים raim j Isa. 56.11.
 רעה raath j Eccl. 8.6.
 רעתי $\rho a a \theta \iota$ o Ps. 35.26.
 רעה ירעם $\iota \epsilon\rho\eta\mu$ o Ps. 49.15.
 רעה roe j Gen. 38.12.
 רעים roim j Isa. 56.11.
 רעי roi j Isa. 44.28.
 רעות rooth j Eccl. 1.14.
 רעם reem j in banereem, Isa. 62.4.
 רעם הרעם $\epsilon\rho\iota\mu$ o Ps. 29.3.
 רעע rou j Isa. 8.9.
 רעש ירעשו $\iota \epsilon\rho a \sigma o u \iota$ o Ps. 46.4.
 רפא ירפא $\iota \epsilon\rho\phi a$ A in Ιερφαναλ , Josh. 18.27.
 רופאים rophaim j Isa. 26.19.
 רפוא $\rho a\phi o u$ G Num. 13.9.
 רפאים raphaim j Isa. 26.19.
 רפה הרפו $a\rho\phi o u$ o Ps. 46.11.
 רצה תרצה $\theta a\rho\sigma a$ B Josh. 12.24; MT: תרצה.
 $\theta \epsilon\rho\sigma a$ G Num. 26.33; MT: תרצה; *ther sa* On ib.
 רצון $\rho a \sigma \omega \nu$ o Mal. 2.13.
 ברצונך $\beta a\rho\sigma \omega \nu a \chi$ o Ps. 30.8.
 ברצונו $\beta a\rho\sigma \omega \nu \omega$ o Ps. 30.6.
 רצפה $\rho \epsilon\sigma\phi a$ G 2 Sam. 3.7; *respha* On ib.
 רצץ ירצו $\iota a\rho o \sigma o u$ o Ps. 49.14; MT: ירצו.
 רק $\rho \epsilon\kappa$ o Ps. 32.6.
 רקב recob j Hos. 5.12.
 רשע לרשע $\lambda a\rho a \sigma a$ o Ps. 32.10.
 הרשעים $a\rho\sigma a \epsilon \iota \mu$ o Ps. 1.1; MT: הרשעים.
 רשע resa j Isa. 26.10; MT: רשע.
 לרשע $\lambda a\rho \epsilon \sigma a$ o Ps. 36.2; MT: לרשע.
 רשף reseph j Hab. 3.5.
 רשת מרשת $\mu \epsilon\rho \epsilon \sigma \theta$ o Ps. 31.5.
 רחיק הרחיק arethic j Ezek. 7.23; MT: הרחוק.
 רתח rathath j Hos. 13.1.

ש

(cf. Introduction, paragraph XIV)

- שאג j e s a g J Amos 1.2.
 שאל o Ps. 89.49.
 לשאל λ a σ ω λ o Ps. 49.15.
 משאל μ ε σ σ ω λ o Ps. 30.4; MT: מן שאל.
 שאון σ α ω ν G Jer. 46.17; s a o n J Hos. 10.14.
 שאל σ α ο υ λ A Gen. 36.37; s a u l On ib.
 שאף s o e p h J Eccl. 1.5.
 שאר s a r J Isa. 10.21; cf. the bisyllabic form in the PV שֹׁאֵר (MdWI, p. ב, line 15); cf. s. v. מעט.
 שבבים s a b a b i m J Hos. 8.6.
 שבועה s a b a a J Isa. 65.15.
 שבעה s a b a o t h J Jer. 5.24.
 שבט β σ α β τ o Ps. 89.33.
 שבת s a b a t J Zech. 1.7.
 שבע a) s a b e On Josh. 19.2.
 σ α β ε ε G in Βηρσαβεε, Josh. 19.2; on the second ε (=ε) cf. paragraph XXIII sub γ; s a b e e On in Bersabee, 1 Sam. 3.20.
 b) s a b a J Isa. 4.1.
 שבע נשבעה ν ε σ β α ϑ o Ps. 89.50.
 נשבעתי ν ε σ β α ϑ [ι] o Ps. 89.36.
 שבעה s a b a J Jer. 15.9; cf. in the BV שְׁבַע 1 Chron. 5.13 in Ms. Ec 1.
 שבק ι ε σ β ο κ A Gen. 25.2; i e s b o c On ib.
 שובק σ ω β η κ G Neh. 10.24.
 שבר a) σ ε β ε ρ A 1 Chron. 2.48.
 b) σ α β ε ρ B ib.
 שבר תשבר ϑ ε σ σ α β ε ρ o Ps. 48.8; with gemination of the *first* radical; cf. on וּשְׁבַר.
 יִשְׁבֵּר ι σ ο υ β ε ρ o Ps. 46.10; MT: יִשְׁבֵּר; without gemination, cf. on אֶזְבֵּב.
 שבת s a b a t On 2 Ki. 4.23.
 שבת השבת ε σ β ε ϑ o Ps. 89.45.
 משבית μ ι σ β ι ϑ o Ps. 46.9; cf. in the BV forms like מַצִּיב Job 5.4; מַצִּיב 1 Sam. 15.12 in MdO, p. 193.

- שגגה seg aga J Eccl. 5.5.
 שגיונות seg ionoth J Hab. 3.1.
 שד sod J Isa. 16.4.
 שדר sa'dud J Jer. 4.30.
 שדה sade J Ezek. 21.2.
 שדות sadoth J Amos 3.10.
 שדי sadai J Ps. 80.14.
 שדה sadda J Eccl. 2.8.
 שדות saddoth J ib.
 שדי σαδδαι G Ezek. 10.5; saddai J Ezek. 1.24.
 שדמה asademoth J Jer. 31.39.
 שדמח σαδημωθ A 2 Ki. 23.4; sademoth On ib.
 שאυ σαυ O Ps. 31.7; cf. B-L. §17z.
 שוב ιασουβ G Num. 26.24; iasub On ib.
 קשוב θασουβ O Ps. 35.13.
 אשוב ασουβ O Ps. 18.38.
 ישובו jasubu J Mic. 5.3; MT: יָשָׁבוּ.
 ישיב ιασειβ A in Ελιασειβ, 1 Chron. 3.24.
 קשיב θασιβ O Ps. 89.44.
 קשיבה ασιβα O Ps. 35.17.
 שנה σαυη A Gen. 14.5; sau siue sauhe On ib.
 שנה μσσαυε O Ps. 18.34.
 שנה σουε A Gen. 25.2; Σωυε lege σουε or σωε cf. paragraph XXIII sub י; sue On ib.
 שוט sot J Isa. 28.15.
 שוע sue J Ezek. 23.23.
 שועו ιεσαυου O Ps. 18.42; cf. B-L. §17z and d'.
 בשועי βεσαυει O Ps. 31.23.
 שועל σουαλ A 1 Chron. 7.36.
 שועלים sualim On in Asarsualim, Josh. 19.3.
 שופר sophar J Isa. 58.1.
 שור surim J Hos. 12.12.
 שור σουσρ G Ex. 15.22; o Ps. 18.30; sur On Gen. 20.1.
 שור בשורי basori J Hos. 9.12.
 ישיר jasir J Jer. 5.26.
 שחה εσθαυου O Ps. 29.2.
 שחח σεωθι O Ps. 35.14; ε is possibly the transliteration of ח; cf. paragraph XXIII sub ח.

- שִׁין si in J Isa. 38.21.
 שֹׁה a) so hol J Hos 5.14.
 b) so hel J ib.
 שֹׁחַק β σ α κ o Ps. 89.38.
 שֹׁחַק is a a c J Amos 7.16; MT: שֹׁחַק.
 שֹׁחַק ο υ ε σ ο κ η μ o Ps. 18.43.
 שָׂר σ α α ρ A in Α χ ι σ α α ρ, 1 Chron. 7.10.
 מִשְׁחָר μ ε σ σ α α ρ o Ps. 110.3; MT: מִשְׁחָר.
 שָׂה σ α α ϑ o Ps. 30.10.
 הִשְׁחָה α σ σ α α ϑ o Ps. 49.10; MT: הִשְׁחָה.
 שֵׁטֶה setta J Isa. 41.19.
 שֵׁטִים settim On Ex. 25.5.
 שָׁטָן σ α τ α ν G 1 Ki. 11.14; satan On ib.
 שָׁטָנָה satana J Gen. 26.21.
 שָׁטַף λ σ ε τ φ o Ps. 32.6.
 שִׁי σ α ι A in Α β ι σ α ι, 1 Sam. 26.6; sai On in Abisai,
 1 Ki. 1.3.
 שִׂי sia J Amos 4.13.
 שִׁיחו sio J in masio, Amos 4.13.
 שִׁם σ α μ o Ps. 46.9.
 שָׁמַח σ α μ ϑ o Ps. 89.41.
 שָׁמַח ο υ σ α μ ϑ ι o Ps. 89.30.
 שִׁמּוֹת σ ι μ ω ϑ o Ps. 46.9 (from the root שִׁם); MT: שִׁמּוֹת.
 שִׁיר σ ι ρ o Ps. 30.1.
 שִׁירֵי ο υ μ ε σ σ ι ρ ι o Ps. 28.7.
 שִׁית saith J Isa. 5.6.
 שָׁחַל ε σ χ ι λ ε χ o Ps. 32.8.
 שָׁחַם σ ε χ ε μ A Josh. 17.2.
 שָׁחַן λ σ α χ η ν α υ o Ps. 89.42.
 שָׁחַר σ α χ α ρ A in Ι σ σ α χ α ρ, Gen. 30.18; sachar On in
 Issachar, ib.
 שָׁחַר־ sac chore J Isa. 28.3.
 שָׁלוֹ β σ α λ ο υ ι o Ps. 30.7.
 שָׁלוֹם σ α λ ω μ G in Α β ε σ σ α λ ω μ, 2 Sam. 3.3; o Ps. 35.20.
 שָׁלוֹם σ α λ ω μ o Ps. 35.27.
 שָׁלַח a) sale On in Mathusale, Gen. 5.21; on e (=n) cf.
 paragraph XXIII sub n.
 b) σ α λ α A Gen. 10.24; sala J Joel 2.8.

- שלח שלח a) *salua* J Gen. 49.21: *sluaa* is a misprint.
b) *selua* J ib., ed. Lagarde.
- שליש *salis* J Isa. 40.12.
- שלם a) *σαλημ* A Gen. 33.18; *salem* On ib.
b) *שלם* *salma* J Amos 1.9.
c) *שלמים* *salamim* J Gen. 34.21.
- שלם שלם *οσσαλημ* O Ps. 31.24 (cf. s. v. *יפה*); MT: *שלם* *שקל*.
שלם *σελλημ* A Num. 26.49.
שלם *μεσουλαμ* G Neh. 6.18.
- שלמה *σαλαμα* G Gen. 36.36; *salama* On ib; MT:
שלמה; cf. Ex. 22.8: MT: *שלם*, Sam. *שלמה*.
- שלמים *salamim* J Ezek. 46.12.
- שלש *salos* J Jonah 3.4.
- שלישי a) *σαλασεια* B Jer. 48.34.
b) *σαλισια* A ib.; cf. in the BV *שליש* 1 Sam. 19.21
in Ms. 105 JThS.
- שם *σαμ* O Isa. 28.13; *sam* J Isa. 28.10.
שם *sama* J Ezek. 48.34.
- שם *σημ* A Gen. 6.10; *σεμ* O Gen. 28.19; *sem* On
Gen. 6.10.
שם *σεμαχ* O Ps. 31.4.
שם *σεμω* O Ps. 29.2.
שם *basemoth* On Gen. 26.34; MT: *שם*; cf. our
remark on *ש*.
- שם* *semoth* On Ezek. 48.1.
שם *βσεμωθαμ* O Ps. 49.12: BCEBΩΘAM
lege M for the second B.
- שמה a) *σαμα* B 1 Sam. 16.9.
שם *σαμωθ* A 1 Chron. 11.27.
b) *שם* *σαμμα* A 1 Sam. 16.9; *samma* On Gen.
36.13.
שם *σαμμωθ* B 1 Chron. 11.27: CAMAΩΘ lege M
for the second A.
- שמם *σαμου* O Ps. 35.15.
שמם *ουσεμα* O Ps. 31.8: OTCEMA lege OTCMA;
MT: *שם*.

יִשְׁמְחוּ יֵסְמוּ O Ps. 46.5; MT: יִשְׁמְחוּ.

יֵסְמוּ O Ps. 35.24; cf. on יִקְרְצוּ.

יִשְׁמְחוּ סְמוּ O Ps. 32.11: IEMOT lege CEMOT; cf. Thompson Facs. 6 (I—C).

יִשְׁמְחוּ סְמֵ O Ps. 30.2; without gemination of the second radical; cf. on יִכְנֹב.

יִשְׁמְחוּ סְמֵ O Ps. 89.43.

יִשְׁמְחוּ סְמָ O Ps. 30.12.

א) s a m a i m J Isa. 1.2.

ב) סַמַּיִם O Ps. 89.30.

ג) סֹוּמֵהֵן O Gen. 1.8.

יִשְׁמִינִי אֶסְמִינִי O Ps. 12.1.

יִשְׁמִיר סַמִּיר B Josh. 15.48; samir On Ju. 10.1.

שִׁמְמָה semema J Isa. 62.4; MT: שִׁמְמָה.

שִׁמְמִים masmim J Ezek. 3.15.

שִׁמְנִים semanim J Isa. 28.1.

שִׁמְעִי סְמֵי B Ex. 6.17; on the second ε (=y) cf.

¶ XXIII sub y; סְמֵי A ib.; semei On ib.

שִׁמְעָה סַמָּה G in Ελίσσάμα, Num. 1.10; O Ps. 28.6.

סַמָּה B in Ελίσσάμας, 1 Chron. 14.7; cf. paragraph XXIII sub y.

s a m e On in Elisame, Num. 1.10; ε=y; cf. paragraph XXIII sub y.

שִׁמְעָה סַמָּה O Ps. 31.23.

יִשְׁמַע יִסְמָה A in Ισμαήλ, Gen. 16.11; i s m a On in Ismahel, ib.

יִשְׁמַע סַמָּה O Ps. 30.11.

סַמָּה O Ps. 28.6: CMAC lege CMAE; MT: שִׁמְעָה.

יִשְׁמְעוּ סִימוּ O Ps. 49.2; semu J Isa. 1.2.

שִׁמְרוּ עִסְמוּ O Ps. 89.29.

יִשְׁמְרוּ יֵסְמוּ O Ps. 89.32.

שִׁמְרוּ סֹוּמֵהֵן G 1 Chron. 7.32; O Isa. 26.2; somer On 1 Ki. 16.24; MT: שִׁמְרוּ.

יִשְׁמְרִים אֶסְסֹוּמִיִּם O Ps. 31.7.

א) שִׁמְשֵׁי χασαμς O Ps. 89.37.

ב) שִׁמְשֵׁי semsi On 1 Sam. 6.18.

- c) שָׁמֶשׁ *σάμες* A Josh. 19.41; *sames* On ib.
 d) *semes* J Isa. 24.23.
 שֶׁן *σεννημω* o Ps. 35.16.
 שָׁנָא *σανηθι* o Ps. 31.7.
 שָׁנָא *σωνη* o Ps. 35.19; MT: שָׁנָא.
 וּמִשְׁנָא *ουμασσανεαι* o Ps. 18.41; MT: 'ומשנ'; with
 gemination of the *first* radical; cf. §32β and §33δ.
 שָׁנָה *ασσανε* o Ps. 89.35; cf. on שָׁנָא.
 שָׁנִי *σηνιθ* o Mal. 2.13.
 שָׁנִים *sene* J Ezek. 15.4.
 שָׁנִים *sanim* J Hab. 3.2.
 שָׁנִי *sane* J Ezek. 15.4.
 שָׁסִם *σασουσ* o Ps. 89.42.
 שְׁעִירִים *sirim* J Isa. 13.21.
 שָׁעָן *εσαν* A Josh. 15.52.
 שַׁעֲרִים *σααρειμ* o Isa. 26.2; *saarim* On Josh.
 15.36; MT: שְׁעָרִים; cf. in PV שְׁעָרִים (MdWI, p. י, 22).
 שַׁעֲרָה *a) σεωρειμ* B 1 Chron. 24.8; *σεωριμ* A
 ib: *σεωριμ* lege *μ* for *ν*; o Hos. 3.2; *seorim* J ib.
b) sorim J Gen. 26.12; MT: שְׁעָרִים.
 שְׁעָרִים *suarim* J Jer. 29.17.
 שָׁפָה *asephathaim* J Ezek. 40.43.
 שָׁפָתִי *σφωθαι* o Ps. 89.35; MT: שָׁפָתִי.
 שָׁפָה *nesphe* J Isa. 13.2.
 שָׁפַט *σαφατ* G Num. 13.5; *safat* On ib.; *saphat* On
 in Josaphat, 1 Ki. 22.2.
 שָׁפָךְ *esphoch* J Joel 3.1.
 שָׁפַל *θεσφιλ* o Ps. 18.30: ΘΕΟΦΙΛ lege C for O;
 cf. Thompson Facs. 4 and 7.
 שָׁפֵלָה *σεφηλα* G Jer. 33.13; *sefela* On ib.; *sephela*
 J Jer. 17.26.
 שָׁפָן *σαφαν* G Jer. 39.14; *safan* On ib.
 שָׁפַק *jeshpicu* J Isa. 2.6.
 שָׁק *σεκ* o Ps. 35.13.
 שָׁקִי *σεκκι* o Ps. 30.12.
 שָׁקַד *seced* J Jer. 1.11.

- שקד soced j Eccl. 12.5.
 שקוץ secuse j Ezek. 20.7.
 שקל secel j Gen. 23.15.
 שקר σερ ο Ps. 35.19.
 שקר ασσακερ ο Ps. 89.34; cf. our note on וקשנאי.
 שר σαρ A in Αχισαρ, 1 Ki. 4.6; sar On in Ahisar, ib.;
 ש for Masoretic ש; cf. the reverse case s. v. שם
 בשמות for Masoretic בשמות (ש for ש).
 שרים sarim j Hos. 12.12.
 שרי sare j Ezek. 21.2.
 שרה sarith j Gen. 32.29.
 שריגים a) sarigim j Gen. 4.10.
 b) sariagim j ib., ed. Lagarde.
 שריד σαριδ A Josh. 19.12; sarid j Obad. 18; sarith
 On Josh. 19.12.
 שרידים saridim j Joel 3.5.
 שרף a) σαραφ A 1 Chron. 4.22; saraph j Isa. 14.29.
 b) seraph j Isa. 6.6.
 שרפים seraphim j Isa. 6.6.
 שרף ישרף σερσφ ο Ps. 46.10.
 שרק σωρηκα G Isa. 5.2; sorec On ib.
 ששון σασων ο Ps. 45.9.
 ששנים σασανειμ ο Ps. 45.1.
 שחת σαθου ο Ps. 49.15.

ת

- תא theim j Ezek. 40.16.
 תאי thee j Ezek. 40.21; MT: תאו.
 תבונה θβουνω θ ο Ps. 49.4.
 תבל thebel j Isa. 13.11.
 תהלה θελαθα χ ο Ps. 35.28.
 תו thav j Isa. 59.20.
 תוא tho j Isa. 51.20.
 תודה thoda j Jer. 17.26.
 תולעת tholath j Isa. 41.14.
 תורה thora j Ezek. 9.4.

- בְּחֹרֶת $\beta \vartheta \omega \rho \alpha \vartheta$ o Ps. 1.2: $\text{BO}\Omega\text{PA}\Theta$ lege Θ for O ;
cf. Thompson Facs. 1–5.
- תִּרְחִי $\vartheta \omega \rho \alpha \vartheta \iota$ o Ps. 89.31.
- תַּחֲנוּן $\vartheta \alpha \nu \omicron \upsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 28.6.
- תַּחֲשׁ $t h a s j$ Ezek. 16.10.
- תַּחַת a) $\vartheta \epsilon \vartheta$ o Ps. 18.39.
תַּחֲתִי $\vartheta \epsilon \vartheta \iota$ o Ps. 18.37; MT: תַּחֲתִי.
תַּחֲתִי $\vartheta \epsilon \vartheta \alpha \iota$ o Ps. 18.48.
- b) תַּחַת $t h e e t h$ On Num. 33.26.
- c) $\vartheta \alpha \alpha \vartheta$ G 1 Chron. 6.22.
- תַּחֲתִי תַּחֲתִים $t h e e t h i m$ On 2 Sam. 24.6.
- תִּמָּן $t h e m a n j$ Hab. 3.3.
- תִּירוֹשׁ $t h i r o s j$ Zech. 9.17.
- תֵּל $\vartheta \epsilon \lambda$ G in $\Theta \epsilon \lambda \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \vartheta$, Neh. 7.61.
- תֵּלָה יִתְלָה $\iota \epsilon \vartheta \lambda \alpha$ A Josh. 19.42; MT: יִתְלָה.
- תִּמְהוּ $j e t h m a u j$ Jer. 4.9.
- תַּמֶּז $t h a m u z j$ Ezek. 8.14.
- תַּמִּיד $\vartheta \alpha \mu \iota \delta$ o Ps. 35.27.
- תַּמִּים a) $\vartheta \alpha \mu \iota \mu$ o Ps. 18.26; $t h a m i m j$ Ezek. 46.13.
b) $\vartheta \alpha \mu \mu \iota \mu$ o Ps. 18.33; ib. 18.31: $\Theta A M M I N$ lege
M for N.
- תַּמָּם תַּתְּמָם $\vartheta \epsilon \vartheta \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \mu$ o Ps. 18.26: $\Theta E M A M M A M$ lege
 Θ for the first M.
- תַּמָּר $\vartheta \alpha \mu \alpha \rho$ G Ruth 4.12; $t h a m a r$ On Gen. 14.7.
תַּמָּרִים $t h a m a r i m j$ Ezek. 40.16; MT: תַּמָּרִים.
- תַּמְרוּרִים $t h e m r u r i m j$ Jer. 31.21.
- תַּנִּים a) $t h e n n i n j$ Jer. 13.22. b) $t h a n n i m j$ ib.
- תַּנִּין $t h a n n i n j$ Isa. 27.1.
- תַּעֲב נֶתְעַב $n e t h a b j$ Isa. 14.19.
- תַּעֲלֻלִים $t h a l u l i m j$ Isa. 3.4.
תַּעֲלֻלִי $t h a l u l e j$ Isa. 66.4.
- תַּפְּאֶרֶת $t h o p h e r t j$ Ezek. 16.12.
- תַּפּוּחַ a) $\vartheta \alpha \varphi \omicron \upsilon$ B in $\text{Βαι} \vartheta \alpha \varphi \omicron \upsilon$ lege $\text{Βαι} \vartheta \vartheta \alpha \varphi \omicron \upsilon$, Josh.
15.53; $\tau \alpha \varphi \omicron \upsilon$ B Josh. 16.8.
 $t h a f u e$ On in Beththafue, Josh. 15.53.
- b) $\vartheta \alpha \pi \varphi \omicron \upsilon \epsilon$ A in $\text{Βε} \vartheta \vartheta \alpha \pi \varphi \omicron \upsilon \epsilon$, Josh. 15.53; cf. para-
graph XXIII sub ה; $t h a f f u e$ On Josh. 12.17;
cf. paragraph XXIII sub פ.

- תַּפֶּל t h a p h e l J Ezek. 13.10.
 חִפְלָה t h e p h e l l a t h J Isa. 38.5.
 וְחִפְלָתִי ο υ θ φ ε λ λ α θ ι ο Ps. 35.13.
 חִפְּתָה t h o p h e t J Jer. 19.6; t o p h e t J Jer. 7.31.
 תַּרְדֵּמָה t h a r d e m a J Isa. 29.10; t a r d e m a J Gen. 15.12.
 תְּרוּעָה t h e r u a J Amos 2.2.
 תְּרָפִים t h e r a f i m J Gen. 31.19.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF HEBREW PROPER NAMES
OCCURRING IN THE DICTIONARY IN THE TRANS-
LITERATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT OR
OF THE ONOMASTICA

(Only the consonants matter; the matres lectionis and the
Masoretic vocalization are immaterial; cf. paragraph I)

ידע	אֵלִידַע	און	אֹוּן	אב, אל	אֲבִיאַל
אל	אֵלִיעֶזֶר	אור	אֹוּרִי	חיל	אֲבִיחִיל
פז	אֵלִיפֶז	און	אֹוּנִי	אב	אֲבִימֶלֶךְ
צפן	אֵלִיצְפָן	אח	אֲחֵאָב	נעם	אֲבִינֶעֶם
קום	אֵלִיקִים	הוד	אֲחִיד	עזר	אֲבִיעֶזֶר
שוב	אֵלִישִׁיב		אֲחִז	שי	אֲבִישִׁי
שמע	אֵלִישְׁמַע	אחז	אֲחִזְיָהוּ		אֲבִל
עזר	אֵלִעֶזֶר	טוב	אֲחִטוֹב	אבל	אֲבִל הַשָּׂטִים
פעל	אֵלִפְעֵל	אח	אֲחִיהוּד	אבל, כרם	אֲבִל קְרָמִים
אל, קנה	אֵלִקְנָה	אח	אֲחִינֶעֶם	מים	אֲבִל מַיִם
	אֲמָה	אח, סמך	אֲחִיסָמָךְ	אבן	אֲבִן הַעֶזֶר
	אֲמֶר	קום	אֲחִיקֶם	שלום	אֲבִשְׁלוֹם
אמר	אֲמַרְיָה	רע	אֲחִירַע	אב	אֲבַת
	אֲנוּשׁ	שחר	אֲחִישָׁחַר		אֲדָם
	אֲסִיר	שר	אֲחִישָׁר		אֲדָמָה
	אֲסָף		אֲסָר	קום	אֲדָנִיקֶם
	אֲצָר		אֲצָר	אדון	אֲדָנִיָּם
ארבה	אֲרָבוֹת	כבוד	אִי קְבוֹד	מלך	אֲדָרְמֶלֶךְ
ארנ	אֲרָנִים	אולם	אִילָם		אֲהֵל
ארי	אֲרִיאֵל	בשת	אִישׁ בִּשְׁת	אהל, ב-	אֲהֵלִיָּה
	אֲרִיָּה	איש	אִישׁ טוֹב	אהל	אֲהֵלִיָּקָמָה
	אֲרִד		אִיָּמָן		אֹוּן
כל	אֲשָׁכַל		אֵלָה		אֹוּן
שען	אֲשָׁעֶן	חנן	אֲלִחְנָן	און	אֹוּנוֹ
	אֲשָׁר	אב, אל	אֲלִיאָב	און	אֹוּנָם

דון	דון	בעל	בעלים	באר	בארות
	הקל	מעון	בעל מעון	באר	בארי
	הוד	פרץ	בעל פרצים	באר, שבע	באר שבע
		צל	בצלאל		בז
ישן	הישנה		בקבוק	בז	בזי
כרוב	הכרבים		ברך		בזק
לחש	הלוחש		ברוך	בחור	בחורים
	הלל		ברית		בטן
סנא	הסנאָה	ברך	ברקאל	און, בית	בית און
עברי	העברים		ברק	בית	בית אל
פרה	הפרה	שם	בשמת	גן	בית הגן
קוץ	הקוץ			כרם	בית הכרם
קטן	הקטן		נבעה	נחנים	בית הנחנים
קריה	הקריה	נבעה	נבעת	עמק	בית העמק
ראש	הראש		נבר	ערבה	בית הערבה
הר	הר שפר	נבר	נבריאל	כר	בית כר
שמש	השמש		נדל	לביא	בית לבאות
		נדל	נדלתי	לחם	בית לחם
	נאב		נדר	מרכבת	בית מרכבות
	נדר		נדרה	מות	בית ענקות
זבר	זבדי	גדרה	גדרות	בית, תפוח	בית תפוח
זבר	זבור	גוי	גוים	בכורה	בכורת
	זבח		גזר	בכור	בכר
	זבל		גיא		בלע
זחל	זחלת	מלח	גיא מלח	בלע	בלעם
זכר	זכרי		גלגל		במה
	זמה	גלילה	גלילות	במה	במות
זמר	זמרי	גל	גלים		גן
זנח	זנוח	גמל	גמול		גן אוני
	זרח	גמל	גמלי	און	גני ברק
זרח	זרחי	נר	גרשם	בן	גסודיה
זרח	זרחיה		גת	סוד	גסודיה
חבר	חבור	רמון	גת רמון	בעל, ברית	בעל ברית
	חבר				בעלה
	חבר		דיאג	המון	בעל המון
	חנב		דבורה	בעלה	בעלות
חג	חגי		דביר	זבוב	בעל זבוב
חדש	חדשה		דבקשת	ידע	בעל ידע

פתח	יִפְתָּח	טֶבַח	חדש	חֲדָשִׁי
צהר	יִצְהָר	טִבְעוֹת		חֻזְקָה
צחק	יִצְחָק	טוֹב		חֻל
	יָצָר		חרב	חֹרֶב
יצר	יִצְרִי	אֹרֶר		חֹקֶם
קום	יָקִים	בָּחַר	חזה	חֻזָּאֵל
	יְרוּשָׁה	בָּלַע		חֻזִּיוֹן
	יָרַח	בִּין	חיל	חִילָם
רחם	יִרְחֵם			חִלִּי
ריב	יָרִיב	נָאֵל		חֻלָּק
רפא	יִרְפָּאֵל	נֹרֶר		חֻלָּק
שבק	יִשְׁבֹּק	יָדִיד	חלק	חֻלָּקִי
שוב	יָשׁוּב	דָּלַף	חלקה	חֻלְקָת
שמע	יִשְׁמָעֵאל	יָדַע		חֶם
	יָשָׁן	נָתַן		חֻמוֹל
	יִשְׁעִי	שָׁפַט	חמל	חֻמּוֹר
שכר	יִשְׁשַׁכֵּר	הִלָּל		חֻמְמִי
תלה	יִתְּלָה	יָאֵל	חמה	חֻנוֹן
יתר	יִתְרוֹ	יָבַל	חנו	חֻסָּד
כברה	בְּכָרַת	זָכַר		חֻסָּה
	בִּידוֹן	רִיב		חֻסְצִי כָה
	בָּכָר	יֹנָה	ב-, חפץ	חֻצִּי
	בָּלִיוֹן	יֹסֵף		חֻצֵּר גִּדָּה
כמר	בְּמָרִים	זָוָה	חצר	חֻצְרוֹת
	בְּנוֹר	זָרַח	חצר	חֻצֵּר מֵנוֹת
	בְּנֻעָנִי	זָרַע	חצר, מות	חֻצֵּר עֵינֹן
	בְּרוּב	כֹּון	חצר	חֻצֵּר שׁוֹעָל
כרוב	בְּרָבִים	יָמִין	שועל	חֻרְדָּה
כרם	בְּרָמִי	מָלָא		חֻרוֹץ
		מָנָה	חרץ	חֻרִיף
דבר, לא	לֹא דָבָר	מָנַע		חֻרָם
בוא	לְבֹאֵא	נָוֵם		חֻרָשׁ
	לְבוֹנָה	עָקַב		חֻרְשָׁת
	לָבֹן	יָעַר		חֻשְׁבָּה
לבן	לְבָנָא	יָעָרִים	חשב	חֻשְׁבוֹן
להב	לְהָבִים	יָפִיעַ		חֻשְׁבִּיָה
לחם	לְחָמִי	פָּנָה	חשב	

עבד	עובד	מִשְׁמַע	לטש	לטושים
עדר	עודד	מִשְׁק		ל'ש
	עורב	מִשְׁרָפוֹת מִים		לפירות
עז	עוגד	שלח		
עזב	עזובה	מִתָּן		מבקר
עזר	עזור	מִתְּנָה		מבצר
עז	עזיאל	מתן		מבשם
עזר	עזרי		מנדל	מנדל נד
	עשרה	נָבַל		מדבר
עטרה	עטרות	נָה		מרון
	עין	נָדָב		מחול
גן	עין גנים	נועד'ה		מחלה
דור	עין דור	נָקַשׁ	מחנה	מחנים
חר, עין	עין חדה	נחת	זהב	מי זקב
עין	עינים	נָכוֹן		מישור
עיר	עירם	נָצִיב	מכונה	מכנות
עם	עמיהוד	נָקַב		מלוא
עם	עמיקרב	נר	מלא	מלותי
עם	עמנואל	נתינים	מלך	מלביאל
	עמק	נָסַן	אל	מלביאלי
עם	עמרם		מלך, צדק	מלבי צדק
	ענה	קָבַד	מלך	מלקם
	ענק	סודי		מן
ענק	ענקים	סוס		מנות
עפר	עפרה	סכה	נחם	מנחם
עקרב	עקרב'ים	סתר	נשה	מנשה
	עקש	סתר		מספר
	ער			מעון
ערבה	ערבות	עָבַד	ענה	מעונים
עשה	עשהאל	עבד		מפקד
	עשן	עבד		מצב
		עבד	מקהלה	מקהלת
פאה	פאת	עָבַר	מר	מרה
פדה	פדהאל	עבר		מרמה
פדה	פדה'ה	עברי		משא
פחה	פחת מואב			משאל
כל, פה	פיכל			משל
	פלג	עָדָר	שדם	משלם

	שועל	בן, ראה	ראובן	פקד	פקוד
	שור		ראש		פָּרָה
שטה	שטים	רב	רָבָה	פרח	פָּרוּחַ
	שטן	רב	רבוֹת		פָּרָץ
	שָׁבָם	רב	רְבִית	פתח	פִּתְחָהּ
	שלה	מג	רב מג		
	שלישיה	סרים, רב	רב סָרִיס		צָבָאוֹת
	שלם	רב	רְבֵת		צוּף
	שלם		רנל	צפה	צוּפִים
	שם	רנל	רנלים		צור
	שמה		רצון	צור	צוּרִיָּאל
שם	שמות	רחוב	רחבת	צור	צוּרִישָׁדִי
שמה	שמות		רחום	צל	צֵלָה
	שָׁמִיר		רחל	פחד, צל	צֵלְפָּהָד
שלמה	שְׁמֵלָה	רום, רם	רם		צָנָה
שמע	שְׁמַעִי	רום, רם	רָמָה		צָפוֹן
	שָׁמֶר	רום, רם	רְמוֹת	צפון	צָפוֹנִי
	שָׁמֶשׁ	רם	רַמַּת		צָפוֹר
שער	שַׁעְרִים	רם	רַמְתִּים	צרע	צְרוּעָה
שערה	שַׁעְרִים	רמון	רמון פָּרָץ		
	שָׁפֶט	רפא	רְפוּאָה		קָדָם
	שְׁפֵלָה	רוץ	רָצִים		קָדְמָה
	שָׁפֹן		רָצָה		קָדָשׁ
	שָׁרִיד				קְדָשִׁים
	שָׁרָף	שאל	שָׁאוֹל	קדש	קְדָשִׁים
	שרק		שָׁאוֹן	קהל	קִהְלָת
			שָׁבַע	קול	קוֹלָהּ
	תחת		שָׁבַר		קוֹץ
תחתי	תַּחְתִּים		שָׁבַת	קרא	קוֹרָא
תל	תַּל מֶלֶח		שָׁדִי		קִינָה
מנה	תַּמְנָה	אור	שְׁדִיאֹר		קִצִּין
מנע	תַּמְנַע	שדמה	שְׁדָמוֹת	ארבע	קְרִית אַרְבַּע
	תָּמַר	שבק	שׁוֹבָק	קריה	קְרִית בְּעַל
	תַּפּוּחַ		שָׁנָה	קריה	קְרִיתִים
פסח	תַּפְּסַח		שׁוּחַ	יער	קְרִית יַעֲרִים
רצה	תַּרְצָה	שמר	שׁוּמֶר	קרן	קְרִינִים

THE MISHNAH TEXT IN BABYLONIA, II

PAUL KAHLE, Bonn a.Rh., Germany

THE first part of this publication appeared in *HUCA* X, pp. 185-222, where I have given a survey of the existing material, with facsimiles of the different MSS, and published the fragments of the MS C. Here follow parts of the fragments of MS A. I have chosen texts preserved as completely as possible. Fragments of MS A have been published by Ch. B. Friedmann in his article "Zur Geschichte der ältesten Mischna-Ueberlieferung, Babylonische Mischna-Fragmente aus der Altkairoer Geniza, veröffentlicht und kritisch untersucht,"¹ to which were to be added some notes. Friedmann had at his disposal only rotographs; I had access to the MS itself. The folios from Oxford and Leningrad have been kindly sent to me in Bonn, so that I was in the position to consult the original MS; during a later visit to Oxford and Cambridge I was able to verify some doubtful passages in the original.

To the importance of these Mishnah fragments I drew attention in my first article. To the fact that these MSS are several centuries older than all MSS of the Mishnah hitherto at our disposal, I may add that the quotations in the 'Aruk of Nathan b. Jehiel prove that he had before him a Mishnah text more or less identical with the text of the MSS here published. As far as I have verified them, these quotations, wherever they diverge from the vulgate text, agree throughout with the text of these Babylonian fragments. We are dealing here, therefore, with widely circulated texts of great reputation even in the West during the 11th century.

Further, as these texts are provided with a reliable and, in general, consistent punctuation, dating as early as the period of the Babylonian Gaons, we can see with certainty how the

¹ Diss. phil. Bonn 1927, published in: *Jahrbuch XVIII der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft in Frankfurt a.M.* 1927.

Mishnah text was read in these circles. Vocalised Hebrew texts of such age are a rarity; among non-biblical texts, only the famous Sifra MS from the Vatican (Heb. 66, olim 351) can be compared with these Mishnah fragments. Such texts provide naturally an infinitely surer basis for a grammar of the Mishnah than texts which were provided with vowels on the analogy of biblical texts at a later period. That Mošeh Zebi Segal has completely misunderstood my arguments may be seen from the reply which he has made to them in the preface to the Hebrew edition of his Grammar of the Mishnah.² He tries to remove my objections by stating that the Grammar of the Mishnah can be built up according to Tiberian punctuated MSS as well as according to MSS with Babylonian vowels, and that between the two systems there are really no important differences.

Certainly it would make no difference if we were dealing in both instances with old and reliably punctuated MSS. But the situation here is such, that only the Babylonian texts are of ancient date, and that we have *no* Tiberian pointed texts of this type. The Tiberian punctuation, added by later scribes and editors to the text, I have called "artificial," not because it is Tiberian, but because it is a modern addition to the consonantal text. It is true that in my publications I have occasionally given proof that the Masoretes in general—not only the Tiberian—have not confined themselves to fixing a pronunciation handed down to them, but have often created something new, for reasons of grammatical consistence, and in order to guarantee a reliable pronunciation of the Hebrew.³ But that is not the question here. The high worth of the Masoretic punctuation so far as it is of really ancient date, I have never doubted. Otherwise I would not have devoted myself for ten years to the work of publishing the Hebrew Bible according to Ben Asher, the greatest authority for the Tiberian Massora.

How is it to be explained that there are no old Mishnah fragments with Tiberian punctuation? Here I have referred in my first article to the similar case of the Targum Onkelos. From

² p. viii f. דקדוק לשון המשנה מאת משה צבי סגל, הוצאת "דבר", תל אביב תרצ"ו.

³ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens* I, Stuttgart 1927, p. 36 ff.

the fragments of the old Palestinian Pentateuch Targum found in the Geniza we may conclude that not only were careful copies of this Targum made in the 7th and 8th centuries—the probable date of the MSS A and E⁴—but that there were also magnificent MSS with the Palestinian Targum written verse for verse with the Hebrew text prepared during the 9th and 10th centuries—the date of the MSS B, C and D. This shows that this Targum had still at this time official recognition and validity. Then the Babylonian Targum Onkelos must have been introduced into Palestine later, and must have become predominant, so that it eventually superseded all MSS of the old Palestinian Targum, the remains of which are only to be found in the Old-Cairo Geniza. So we may explain the fact that the Targum Onkelos has been preserved in an old and reliable tradition with Babylonian punctuation only, a tradition which, with certain modifications, continued to exist in Yemen, where it was found in MSS brought from there to Europe during the last century. When, after the collapse of the Babylonian Academies, the Babylonian punctuation became obsolete among the Jews, the attempt was made to turn it into Tiberian punctuation, and in this way the punctuation of the Targum came to a state of absolute confusion.

In a similar way the Mishnah text was introduced into Palestine at some time from Babylonia, where it received its final form. The authority of this Mishnah, which was the basis of the Babylonian Talmud, appears to have been so great, that it displaced and superseded the Mishnah which previously must have been current in Palestine, so that it has been suggested that this Babylonian Mishna took the place of an earlier Mishnah in the Palestinian Talmud. In any case, here too we see that the oldest remains of MSS of this Mishnah with Tiberian punctuation are certain to have been attempts to turn an already existing Babylonian into a Tiberian punctuation. In later times better results were achieved with the Mishnah than with the Targum Onkelos, since here there was the analogy of the Bible text in which the Tiberian punctuation reached its fullest develop-

⁴ *Masoreten des Westens* II, Stuttgart 1930, p. 2* f.

ment. But as this punctuation was added at a later time and only on analogy with the Bible text, it has no real intrinsic worth, and on that account I have called it "artificial."

A far better attempt to do justice to these Mishnah texts has been made by Hanoch Yalon,⁵ who was guided chiefly by grammatical considerations; his main interest being of course a practical one, namely to obtain reliable material for an authoritative and well attested pronunciation of Hebrew in present day Palestine.

That Babylonian pointed texts are of great value for this purpose also becomes clear on closer examination. The pronunciation of Hebrew in Palestine in the 2nd and 4th centuries, so far as we can identify it from suggestions in the Talmud, from evidence of contemporary Greek and Latin texts in transcription and on other philological grounds, was much more truly preserved in Babylonia than in Tiberias in Palestine. It is certainly an interesting fact that the so-called Sephardic pronunciation of Hebrew in present day Palestine has become the rule, although hardly anyone realises that this has been essentially influenced by the Babylonian pronunciation. At the same time the Sephardic pronunciation was strongly influenced by the Tiberian, once that came to be the recognised and valid system. The Babylonian tradition we have only been in a position to study since the beginning of this century, and it would be worth considering whether one should not allow it a much greater and more authoritative influence in the modern pronunciation of Hebrew in Palestine.

When Segal, referring himself to the grammar of Bauer-Leander, says that the differences between the two systems of punctuation are unimportant, he shows thereby that he has never made a serious attempt at real study of these Babylonian pointed texts. In Bauer-Leander's grammar there are quoted only a few outstanding divergences. These do just as little justice to the real nature of these texts as the variants to the Ben Asher text of the *Biblia Hebraica* do to the Babylonian Bible

⁵ *Bulletin of Hebrew Language Studies* (קוטרסים לעניני הלשון העברית), Edited by Hanoch Yalon, Vol. I, Jerusalem 1937, pp. 26-29.

texts. That will be clear at once, if the attempt is made to build up a grammar of Hebrew simply on the basis of *Babylonian* texts. This is true for the Hebrew of the Bible, just as for that of the Mishnah. For a Mishnah grammar the texts here published provide rich material, and a grammar made on the basis of these texts would be quite different from that of Segal. It would give us for the first time a reliable starting point in determining how the Hebrew of the Mishnah was spoken at the time of the Babylonian Gaons.

Yalon seeks to defend certain peculiarities of the Babylonian punctuation by drawing attention to the fact that it has been preserved in the pronunciation of the Yemenites up to the present day, and he thinks that for that reason they deserve consideration. This comparison is, however, unfortunate. We know, it is true, that the vowel-signs of the Babylonian punctuation have been preserved in Yemen, but the punctuation and pronunciation of Hebrew in Yemen have already been largely influenced by the Tiberian. On that account examples of the pronunciation of Hebrew in Babylonia cannot be derived from Hebrew texts from Yemen.

Nevertheless our thanks are due to Yalon for having drawn attention with considerable emphasis to the high scientific value of these fragments. That cannot really be doubted, and I am sure that scholars will appreciate the great importance of these fragments, once larger and reliably edited texts make a serious study of them possible.

Cambr. E 1 89

a וחכמים אומרים יקח נ . . . ה המציא שטר חובן על חבירו והלא Ket. 1
הוציא נ . . . אילו חייב הייתי לך היה לך להיפרע את שלך
שמכרת ולי . . . זה היה פקיה שזמכר לו את הקרקע מפני שהוא 9
יכול למשכנו נט שנים שהוציאו שטר חוב וזה על זה אדמון אומר
אילו חייב הייתי לך כאיזה נצר . . . אומרים זה גובה שטר חובו
וזה גובה שטר חובו י ושלש ארצות לנישואין יהודה ועבר הירדן 10
וגליל אין מוציאים מעיר לעיר ולא מכרך ולכרך אבל באותה
הארץ מוציאים מעיר לעיר ומכרך לכרך אבל לא מעיר לכרך
ולא ומכרך לעיר מוציאים מנוה הרע לנוה היפה אבל לא מנוה
היפה לנוה הרע רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אף לא מנוה הרע
לנוה היפה שהנוה היפה בודק יא הכל מעלים לארץ וישראל ואין 11
הכל מוציאים הכל מעלים לירושלם ואין הכל מוציאים אחד אנשים
ואחד ועבדים כאיזה צדו נשא אשה בארץ ישראל וגירשה בארץ
ישראל נותן לה ממעות ארץ ישראל נשא אשה בארץ ישראל
וגירשה בקפוטקיה נותן לה ממעות ארץ ישראל נשא אשה
בקפוטקיה וגירשה בארץ ישראל נותן לה ממעות ארץ ישראל רבן
שמעון וכן גמליאל אומר ממעות קפוטקיה נשא אשה בקפוטקיה
וגירשה בקפוטקיה נותן לה ממעות קפוטקיה הנא פרקא יג
הלכתא יא חסלת כתובות פרקי יג

¹ Others read: מנוה.

² Others read: לנוה.

³ Others read: מנוה.

⁴ Others read: לנוה.

⁵ Others read: מנוה.

⁶ Altered to ממעות.

⁷ Seems to be altered to ממעות.

- Ned. 1 1 נדרים פרקא קדמאה. כל כינוי נדרים כנדרים וחרמים
 כחרמים ושבועות כשבועות ונזירות כנזירות האומר לחבירו
 מודר אני ממך מופרש אני ממך מורחק ואני מזמך שאני אוכל
 לך שאני טועם לך אסור מנודה אני לך רבי עקיבה היה חוכך
 בזה ולהחמיר ב' כנדרים רשעים נדר בנזיר ובקרבן ובשבועה
 וכנדרים כשרים לא אמר וכלום וכנדרותם נדר בנזיר ובקרבן
 ג האומר קונם קונא קונס הר"י אילו כינויים [...] 3[4.5]
- 2 1 אסור הנא פורקא קדמאה הלכתא ה' פרקא ב' אילו מותרין חולין
 שאוכל לך כבשר חזיר וכעבודה זרה כנבילות כטריפות כשקצים
 כרמשים כחלת אהרן וכתרומתו מותר אמר ולאשתו הרי את
 עלי כאימה פותחין לו פתח ממקום אחר שלא יקל את ראשו
 לכך קונם שאני ישן שאני מדבר שאני מהלך האומר לאשתו
 קונם שני משמשיך הרי זה בל ניחל דברו שבועה שאני ישן
 שאני מדבר שאני מהלך אסור ב' קרבן לא אוכל לך וקרבן
 שאוכל לך לא קרבן לא אוכל לך מותר שבועה לא אוכל
 לך ושבועה שאוכל לך לוא שבועה לא אוכל לך אסור זה
 חומר בשבועות מבנדרים וחומר מבנדרים מבשבועות כאיזה
 צד אמר קונם סוכה שאני עושה לולב שאני נעשה נוטל תפלין
 שאני נותן בנדרים אסורו ובשבועות מותר שאין נשבעין לעבור
 על המצות ג יש נדר ובתוך נדר ואין שבועה בתוך שבועה
 כאיזה צד אמר הריני נזיר אם אוכל הריני נזיר אם אוכל
 ואכל חיב על כל אחת ואחת שבועה שלא אוכל שבועה שלא
 אוכל שבועה שולא אוכל ואכל אינו חיב אילא אחת סתם 3

⁸ MS. לבן.

⁹ Read בנדרים.

נִדְרִים לַהֲחִמִּיר וּפִירוֹשָׁן לַהֲקַל כִּאֲזוּהָ צָד אֲמַר הוֹרִי עָלַי כִּבְשֵׁר
 מְלִיחַ וְכִיּוֹן נֶסֶךְ אִם שְׁלֹשְׁמִים נִדֵּר אֲסוּר וְאִם שְׁלֹעֲבוּדָה זָרָה
 מוֹתֵר וְאִם סֵתָם אֲסוּר הָרִי עָלַי כִּחֲרָם אִם כִּחֲרָם שְׁלֹשְׁמִים
 נִדֵּר אֲסוּר וְאִם שְׁלִכְהֲנִים מוֹתֵר וְאִם סֵתָם אֲסוּר הָרִין עָלַי
 כִּמְעֵשֶׁר אִם כִּמְעֵשֶׁר בְּהֶמָּה נִדֵּר אֲסוּר וְאִם שְׁלֹדֶגֶן מוֹתֵר וְאִם
 סֵתָם אֲסוּר הָרִי עָלֵינוּ כִּתְרוּמָה אִם כִּתְרוּמַת הַלְשֹׁכָה נִדֵּר אֲסוּר
 וְאִם שְׁלֹגוֹרֶן מוֹתֵר וְאִם סֵתָם אֲסוּר דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִירוּ וְחִכָּמִים
 אוֹמְרִים סֵתָם תְּרוּמָה בִּיהוּדָה אֲסוּרָה וּבְגָלִיל מוֹתֵרֶת שְׁאִין אֲנִשִּׁי
 הַגָּלִיל וּמְכִירִין אֶת תְּרוּמַת הַלְשֹׁכָה סֵתָם חֲרָמִים בִּיהוּדָה מוֹתֵרִין
 וּבְגָלִיל אֲסוּרִין שְׁאִין אֲנִשִּׁי הַגָּלִיל מְכִירִים אֶת חֲרָמֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים
 דִּן נִדֵּר בְּחֲרָם וְאֲמַר לֹא נִדְרָתִי אֵילָא בְּחֲרָמוֹ שְׁלִים נִדֵּר וּבִקְרָבָן . . .

Cambr. F 6 4

- a רבי אוליִעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אָנוּמַר אֶף הַרוּצָה לַהֲדִיר אֶת חֲבִירוֹ 3 1
 שִׂיאֵכֵל אֲצִלוֹ וְאָמַר כָּל נִדְרָן שְׁאִנִּי עֲתִיד לְדוֹר הָרִי הוּא וּבִטֵּל . . .
 בִּנְדָרֵי הַחוּי אֲמַר קוֹנָם אִם לֹא רֵאִיתִי בְּדֶרֶךְ הַנוּזָה כִּיּוֹצֵאִי 2
 מִצָּרִים אִם לֹא רֵאִיתִי נָחַשׁ כְּקוֹרֶת בֵּית הַזֶּבֶד נִדְרֵי שְׁגוּתָא אֲמַר
 קוֹנָם אִם אֲכָלְתִּי אִם נִשְׁתִּיתִי וְנִזְכַּר שֶׁאֲכָל וְשָׁתָה שְׁאִנִּי אוֹכֵל
 שְׁאִנִּי שׁוֹתָה וְשָׁכַח וְאֲכָל וְשָׁתָה אֲמַר קוֹנָם וְאִשְׁתִּי נִהְיָת לִי שְׁגוּבָה
 אֶת כִּסִּי וְשׁוֹהַכְתָּ אֶת בְּנִי וְנוֹדַע שְׁלֹא הִכְתָּהוּ וְנוֹדַע שְׁלֹא גִנְבָה
 וְרָאָה אוֹתָן אוֹכְלִים תָּאֲנִים וְאָמַר הָרִי הֵן עָלֶיכֶם קְרָבָן נִמְצְאוּ
 אֲבִיו אוֹ אֲחִיו וְהָיוּ עִמָּהֶם וְאַחֲרֵים בֵּית שְׁמִי אוֹמְרִים הֵם מוֹתֵרִים הֵם
 וְמָה שְׁעִמָּהֶם אֲסוּרִין וּבֵית הַלֵּל אוֹמְרִים אֵילוֹ נוֹאִילוּ מוֹתֵרִים
 גִּן נִדְרֵי אוֹנְסִים הִדִּירוּ חֲבִירוֹ שִׂיאֵכֵל אֲצִלוֹ וְחָלָה הוּא אוֹ שְׁחָלָה 3
 וּבָנוּ אוֹ שְׁעָכְבוּ נִהָר הָרִי אֵילוֹ נִדְרֵי אוֹנְסִים דִּן נִדְרִים לַהֲרָגִים 4

¹ Above the line.

ולח'למים ולמ'וכסים ושהיא תרומה אף על פי שאינה תרומה
 שלבית המלך ואף על פי שאינה שלהם בית שמי ואומרים בכל
 נודרים חוץ משבועה ובית הלל אומרים אף בשבועה בית שמי
 אומרים ולא יפתח לו בנדבך ובית הלל אומרים יפתח לו בית
 שמי אומרים במה שהוא מדירו ובית והלל אומרים אף במה
 שאינו מדירו ה' כאיזה צד אמרו לו אמור קונם אשתי נהנת
 5 ולי ואמר קונם אשתי ובני נהנים לי בית שמי אומרים אשתו מותרת
 ובני אסורים ובית והלל אומרים אילו ואילו מותרים ו הרי הנטיעות
 6 האילו קרבן אם אינן נקצצות טלית נז קרבן אם אינה נשרפת
 יש להם פדיון הרי הנטיעות האילו קרבן עד שיקצצו וטליתו
 7 זו קרבן עד שתשרף אין להם פדיון ה' הנודר מיורדי הים
 מותר ביושבי היבשה [מיושבי היבשה אסור ביורדי שיורדי הים
 בכלל יושבי היבשה ולא כאילו ההולכים ומעכו ל יפו אלא
 8 מי שדרכו לפרש ה' הנודר מרואי החמה אסור אף בסומים
 9 שלא [נתכוון זה אלא למי שהחמה רואה אותן ה' הנודר משחורי
 הראש אסור בקריחים ...

b [שואני נהנה להם והם לני יהנה ... מותר בערלין
 14 ישראל ואסור ...] ומותר במולי נגוים² שאין העורלה
 קרואה ...] וכל בית ישראל ערלי לב ואומר פן
 תשמחנה ...] ואומר והיה הפלשתי הערל הזה כאחד מהם
 כי חרף מערכות אלהים חיים רבין אלעזר בן עזריה אומר
 מאוסה העורלה שנתנו בנה גוים שנ כי כל הגוים ערלים וכל
 בית ישראל ערלי לב רבי ישמעאל אומר גדולה ומילה ששלש
 עשרה בריתות נכרתו עליה רבי יוסה הגלילי אומר גדולה

² נגוים is missing but a circellus over the ש calls attention to it.

הַמִּילָה שֶׁהִיא דוּחָהּ אֶת הַשְּׁבֵת הַחֲמֹרָה רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן קֶרְחָה
 אָמַר גְּדוּלָּה הַמִּילָה שְׁלֹא נִתְּלָה לְמַעַן הַצְדִּיקָנוּ עָלֶיהָ מְלֹא
 שְׁעָה רַבִּי נַחֲמִיָּה אָמַר גְּדוּלָּה הַמִּילָה שֶׁהִיא דוּחָהּ אֶת הַנִּנְעִים
 רַבִּי מֵאִיר אָמַר גְּדוּלָּה הַמִּילָה שְׁכָלָהּ הַמַּצּוֹת שֶׁעָשָׂה אֲבִינוּ
 אֲבֵרָהֶם לֹא נִקְרָא שְׁלִים אֵילָא עַד שֶׁמָּל שְׁנֵי הַנְּתַחֲלָךְ לִפְנֵי וְהִי
 תָּמִים טוֹ דְּבָר אַחֲרֵי גְדוּלָּה הַמִּילָה שֶׁאֵילּוּלִי הִיא לֹא בְּרָא
 הַקָּדוֹשׁ וּבִרְוֹךְ הוּא אֵת עוֹלָמוֹ שְׁנֵי כֹה אִמֵּר יִי אִם לֹא בְּרִיתִי
 יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה חוֹקוֹת שְׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ לֹא וְשִׁמְתִּי יוֹ רַבִּי אָמַר גְּדוּלָּה
 מִילָה שֶׁהִיא שְׁקוּלָה כְּגֹדֶל כָּל הַמַּצּוֹת שֶׁבִּתּוּרָה שְׁנֵי הֵנָּה דָּסוּ הַבְּרִית
 אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת יִי עִמָּכֶם עַל כָּל הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק אֶ
 הַלְכָתוֹא יוֹ פֶּרֶק אֶ דִּ אֵין בֵּין הַמּוֹדֵר הַנָּאָה מַחְבִּירוֹ לְמוֹדֵר
 מִמֶּנּוּ מֵאֵכֶל אֵילָא דְרִיסָתָהּ הַרְגֵּל וְכִלְיָן שְׁאֵין עוֹשִׂין בָּהֶן אוֹכֵל
 נֶפֶשׁ הַמּוֹדֵר מֵאֵכֶל מַחְבִּירוֹ לֹא יִשְׁאִילֵנוּ נֶפֶשׁ וְכִבְרָה וְרוּחִים וְתִנּוֹר
 אֲבָל מִשְׁאִילוֹ חֵלֶק וְטִלִּית נִזְמִים וְטַבְעוֹת וְכָל דְּבָר שְׁאֵין עוֹשִׂין
 בּוֹ אוֹכֵל נִפְשׁוֹ מְקוֹם שֶׁמִּשְׁכִּירִים כְּיוֹצֵא בָּהֶם אֲסוּר בַּהֲמִידָה
 הַנָּאָה מַחְבִּירוֹ שׁוֹקֵל אֶת וְשִׁקְלוֹ וְפוֹרֵעַ אֶת חוּבוֹ וּמַחְזִיר לוֹ
 אֶת אֲבִידָתוֹ מְקוֹם שֶׁנּוֹטְלִים עָלֶיהָ שְׂכָר תְּפִילָּה הַנָּאָה לְהַאֲרִיכָהּ
 וְתוֹרֵם אֶת תְּרוּמָתוֹ וּמַעֲשָׂרוֹתָיו לְדַעְתּוֹ וּמַקְרִיב עָלָיו קִנְיָ זִבְיָ
 קִנְיָ זִבְיָ קִנְיָ יוֹלָדוֹת חֲטָאוֹת ...

Cambr. Or. 1080

1a הַחֲמֵה אֲבָל לֹא בִּן ... עֲזָמוֹ עַל הַשְּׁלָחַן אֲבָל לֹא מִן ... [עֲמֹ
 מִן הָאֵיבֹס שֶׁלִּפְנֵי הַפּוֹעֲלִים ... אוֹמְרִים עוֹשֶׂה הוּא רָחוֹק מִמֶּנּוּ
 הַ ...] לֹא יוֹרֵד לְתוֹךְ שְׂדֵיהֶוּ וְאֵינוֹ אוֹכֵל מִן הַנּוֹטוֹת וּבִשְׁבִיעִית
 לֹא יוֹרֵד ... הַנּוֹטוֹת נִדָּר מִמֶּנּוּ מֵאֵכֶל לִפְנֵי שְׁבִיעִית יוֹרֵד לְתוֹךְ

³ Jer. 33.25.

שְׁדִיָּהּוּ]... ובשביעיות יורד ואוכל וְ הַמֹּדֵר הַנָּאָה מַחֲבִירוֹ לֹא
 יִשְׁאִילֵנוּ נֹלֵא יִשְׁאֵל מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא יִלְוֵנוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא יִמְכֹּר לוֹ וְלֹא
 יִקַּח מִמֶּנּוּ כֹאֲזֹה צָד אֹמֵר וְלוֹ הִשְׁאִילֵנִי פֶרֶתְךָ וְאָמַר לוֹ אֵינָהּ
 פְּנוּיָהּ וְאָמַר קֹנֶם שְׂדֵה שְׁאֵנִי חֹרֵשׁ בָּהּ לַעֲוֹלָם אִם הִיא נִדְרָכָה לַחֲרֹשׁ
 הוּא אֲסוּר וְכָל אֲדָם מוֹתֵרִים וְאִם אֵין דְּרָכָה לַחֲרֹשׁ הוּא וְכָל
 הָאָדָם אֲסוּרִים וְהַמֹּדֵר הַנָּאָה מַחֲבִירוֹ וְאֵין לוֹ מָה יֵאָכֵל
 הוֹלֵךְ אֲצֵל הַחֲנוּנִי וְאָמַר אִישׁ פְּלוֹנִי מוֹדֵר נִמְנִי הַנָּאָה וְאֵין
 יוֹדֵעַ מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה וְהוּא נוֹתֵן לוֹ וּבֹא וְנוֹטֵל מִזֶּה הִיא בֵּיתוֹ
 לְבָנוֹת וְגִדְרָה לְגִדְרוֹ שְׁדִיָּהּוּ לְקִצּוֹר הוֹלֵךְ אֲצֵל הַפּוֹעֲלִים וְאָמַר
 אִישׁ פְּלוֹנִי מוֹדֵר הַנָּאָה מִמֶּנּוּ וְאֵין יוֹדֵעַ מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה וְהֵם עוֹשִׂים
 עִמּוֹ וּבָאִים וְנוֹטְלִים שְׂכָרָם מִזֶּה טָ הֵיוּ מֵהַלְכִים בְּדֶרֶךְ נוֹאֵין
 לוֹ מִהֵן יֵאָכֵל נוֹתֵן לְאַחֵר מִשּׁוֹם מִתְּנָהּ וְחֵלָּא מוֹתֵר בָּהּ וְאִם
 אֵין עֲמָהֶם אַחֵר מְנִיחַ עָלָיָהּ וְהַסְלַע אִין עָלָיָהּ הַגְּדִיר וְאָמַר הֲרִי
 הֵן מוֹפְקָרִים לְכָל מִי שִׁיִּחְפוּץ וְהֵלָּא נוֹטֵל וְאוֹכֵל וְרַבִּי יוֹסֶה
 וְאִסְרוּ הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק אֶת הַלְכָתָא טָ פֶּרֶק אֶת הַשְׁתּוּתָפִין שֶׁנִּדְרוּ הַנָּאָה
 זֶה מִזֶּה וְאִסְרוּ מִלְּהִיכָנֶס לְחֶצֶר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אָמַר
 זֶה נִכְנָס לְחֶצֶר שְׁלֹו זֶה נִכְנָס לְחֶצֶר וְשִׁלּוֹ וְשִׁנְיָהֶם אִסְרוּ
 מִלְּהַעֲמִיד רִיחִים וְתִנּוֹר וּמִלְּגָדֵל תְּרִנְגוּלִין הִיא אַחֵר מֵהֶם מוֹדֵר
 וּמִחֻבֵּירוֹ הַנָּאָה לֹא יִכְנָס לְחֶצֶר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אָמַר
 יָכוֹל הוּא לֹמֵד לוֹ לְחֶצֶר [שְׁלִי...]

Ned. 4 6

7

8

9

5 1

5

וְאֵת עָלֵי שְׁנֵיהֶם]... שְׁבוּאוֹתָהּ הָעִיר הִיא אוֹיֵה הוּא... שְׁבוּאוֹמֶצֶעַ
 הַדֶּרֶךְ וְאִיזָה הוּא דָּבָר... וְהַתִּיבָה וְהַסְפָּרִים וְהַכּוֹתֵב חִלְקוֹ לְנִשְׂיָא
 וְרַבִּי... וְאֶחָד כּוֹתֵב לְהַדְיוֹט מָה בֵּין כּוֹתֵב לְנִשְׂיָא לְכּוֹתֵב לְהַדְיוֹט
 שֶׁהַכּוֹתֵב לְנִשְׂיָא אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ לְזָכוֹת וְהַכּוֹתֵב לְהַדְיוֹט צָרִיךְ לְזָכוֹת
 וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה צָרִיכִים לְזָכוֹת וְלֹא דִיבְרוּ

1b

בְּנָשִׂיא אֵילָא בְּהוּה רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר אֵין אַנְשֵׁי הַגְּלִיל צְרִיכִים Ned. 5
 לכתובו שְׁכָבָר יִכְתְּבוּ אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם עַל יְדֵיהֶם וְ הַמּוֹדֵר הִנָּה 6
 מַחְבִּירוֹ וְאֵין נָלוּ מַה יֵּאכַל נֹתֵן לֵאחֲרָיו מִשּׁוּם מִתְּנָהּ וְהִלָּא מוֹתֵר
 בָּהּ מַעֲשֶׂה בְּבֵית חוֹרוֹן בְּאַחַד שְׁהִיָּה וְאֵבִיו מוֹדֵר מִמֶּנּוּ הִנָּה
 וְהִיחַ מִשִּׂיא אֵת בְּנוֹ וְאִמָּר לַחְבִּירוֹ הֲרִי הֲחָצֵר וְהַסְעוּדָה נִתּוֹנִים
 לָךְ מִתְּנָהּ אֵין לִפְנִיךָ עַד שִׁיבֹא אֲבָהּ וְיֵאכֹל עִמָּנוּ בַּסְעוּדָה
 אִמָּר לוֹ אִם שְׁלִי הֵם הֲרִי הֵם מוֹקְדֵשִׁים וְלִשְׁמִים אִמָּר לוֹ לֹא
 נִתְּחִי לָךְ אֵת שְׁלִי אֵילָא שְׁתַּקְדִּישֶׁם לִשְׁמִים אִמָּר לוֹ וְלֹא נִתְּחִה
 לִי אֵת וְשִׁלַּךְ אֵילָא שְׁתַּהֲרֵא אֲתָהּ וְאִבִּיךָ אוֹכְלִים וְשׁוֹתִים וְמִתְרַצִּים
 זֶה לָזֶה ³וְיִהִיָּה עֹוֹן תִּלּוֹי בְּרָאשׁוֹ אִמָּנוּ חֲכָמִים כֻּלָּן מִתְּנָהּ שְׁאִינָה
 שְׁאֵם הַקְדִּישָׁה תִּהְיֶה ⁴מִקְדֻשָּׁת אֵינָה מִתְּנָהּ הִנָּה פִּרְקָא וְהִי הִלְכְתָּא וְ
 פִּרְקָא וְ הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַתְּבִשִּׁיל מוֹתֵר בְּצִלּוֹי וּבִשְׁלֹק אִמָּר קוֹנֵם 6 1
 תְּבִשִּׁיל שְׁאֵנִי טוֹעֵם אִסּוּר בַּמַּעֲשֶׂה קְדִירָה רַךְ וּמוֹתֵר ⁵בְּעֵבֶה
 וּמוֹתֵר בְּבִיצָה טְרִמִּטוֹן וּבִדְלָעַת הִרְמוּצָה בְּ הַנּוֹדֵר מִמַּעֲשֶׂה 2
 קְדִירָה אֵינוֹ אִסּוּר אֵילָא מִמַּעֲשֶׂה רִתְחָתָהּ אִמָּר קוֹנֵם יוֹרֵד
 לַקְדִּירָה שְׁאֵנִי טוֹעֵם אִסּוּר מִכֹּל הַמִּתְבַּשְּׁלִים בְּקִדְרָה גְּ מִן הַכָּבוֹשׁ 3
 אֵינוֹ [אִסּוּר] אֵילָא מִן הַכָּבוֹשׁ שְׁלִירֵק כָּבוֹשׁ שְׁאֵנִי טוֹעֵם אִסּוּר
 בְּכֹל הַכָּבוֹשִׁים דְּ מִן [וְהַשְּׁלֹק] אֵינוֹ אִסּוּר אֵילָא מִן הַשְּׁלֹק 4
 שְׁלִירֵק שְׁלֹק שְׁאֵנִי טוֹעֵם אִסּוּר בְּכֹל הַשְּׁלֹקִים וְהִי מִן... 5
 ט... הַבּוֹשֵׁר זֶה עַלִּי שְׁהַנּוֹדֵר... יְ הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הֵיִן מוֹתֵר בַּתְּבִשִּׁיל 2a 9.10
 [אִם... יֵשׁ בּוֹ בְּנוֹתָן טַעַם הֲרִי זֶה אִסּוּר יֵא... מוֹתֵר] 11

¹ On the margin.

² Originally written שְׁלֵא.

³ Originally written: וְהִיחַ.

⁴ MS. מְקוֹדֶשֶׁת sic!

⁵ Changed to בְּעֵבֶה.

בשמך אמר קונם זיתים וענבים [...] יב הנודר מן התמרים Ned. 6 12
 מותר בדבש תמרים מסתנויות... רבי יהודה בן בתירה אומר
 כל ששם תולדותו קרויה עליו ונדר ממנו [...] יג הנודר 13
 מן היין מותר ביין תפוחים ומן השמן ומותר שומשמן מן הדבש
 מותר בדבש תמרים זמן החומץ מותר בחומץ סתנויות מן והכרישים
 מותר בקפלוטות מן הידק מותר בידקות השדה מפני שהוא
 שם לווי יד מן והכרוב אסור באספרגוס מן האספרגוס מותר 14
 בכרוב מן הגריסים אסור במקפה ורבי יוסה מתיר מן המקפה
 מותר בגריסים מן המקפה אסור בשום ורבי יוסי מתיר ומן
 השום מותר במקפה מן העדשים אסור באשישים ורבי יוסי
 מתיר מן האשישים ומותר בעדשים טו חטה חטים שאני טועם 15
 אסור בהם בין קמח בין פת גרם גריסים שאני טועם אסור
 בהם בין חיים בין מבושלים רבי יהודה אומר אמר קונם גרים
 וחוטא שאני טועם ומותר לכוס חיים הנא פרקא ו הלכתא טו
 פרקא ו הנודר מן והירק מותר בדלועים רבי עקיבה אסר 7 1
 אמרו לו לרבי עקיבה והלא אומר אדם לשלוחו קח ולנו ירק
 והוא אומר לא מצאתי אילא דילועים אמר להם כו הדבר
 או שמא אומר הוא לא נמצאתי אילא קטנית אילא שהדלועים
 בכלל ירק ואסור בפול המצרי לח ומותר ביבש וב הנודר מן 2
 הדגן אסור בפול המצרי היבש דברי רבי מאיר וחכמים אומרים
 אינו אסור אילא מחמשת המינים ורבי מאיר אומר הנודר מן
 התבואה אינו אסור אילא מנחמשת...

2b ... אסור מן האגף ולפנים נו קונם...

7 6.7

⁶ Sic!

⁷ MS. מן.

⁸ Above *i* is written *a*: האספרגוס.

אף על פי אסור בחילופיהם ובגידוליהם... ובגידוליהם Ned. 7 7
 בדבר שזרעו כאלה [...] ה האומר לאשתו קונם מעושה 8
 ידיך... אסור בחילופיהם ובגידוליהם שאני אוכל [...] בדבר 9
 שזרעו כאלה אבל בדבר שאין זרעו כאלה [...] ט שאתו 9
 עושה ואני אוכל עד הפסח שאת עושה ואני מתכסה [...] מותר 10
 לוכל ולהתכסות לאחר הפסח י שאת עושה עד הנפסח אני 10
 אוכל ושאתו עושה עד הפסח ואני מתכסה עשתה לפני הפסח 11
 אסור לונכל ולהתכסות לאחר הפסח יא שאת נהנת לי עד 11
 הפסח אם תלכי לבית אביך עד החג הלכה ולפני הפסח אסורה 12
 בהנאתו עד הפסח לאחר הפסח כל יחל דברו יב שאת נהנת 12
 נלי עד החג אם תלכין לבית אביך עד הפסח הלכה לפני 12
 הפסח אסורה בהנאתו עד החג ומותר נליך אחר הפסח 12
 הנא פרקא ו הלכתא יב פרקא ה קונם יין שאני טועם נהיום 8 1
 אינו אסורו אילא עד שתחשך שבת זו אסור בכל השבת והשבת 12
 שעברתה חדש זה אסור בכל החדש וראש חדש לעתיד לבוא 12
 שנה זו אסור בכל השנה וראש השנה לעתיד לבוא ושבוע זה 12
 אסור בכל השבוע והשביעית לשעבר ב ואם אמר יום אחד 2
 שנבת אחת חדש אחד שנה אחת שבוע אחד אסור מיום ליום 2
 ג עד הפסח אסור עד ושיגיע עד שיהא אסור עדו שיצא עד 8 3
 לפני הפסח רבי מאיר אומר עד שיגיע רבי יוסי אומר ועד 3
 שיצא ד עדו הקציר עד הבציר עד המסיק אינו אסור אילא 4
 עד שיגיע עד שיהא אסור עד שיצא זה כלל כל שזמנו קבוע 4
 ואמר עד שיגיע אסור עד שיגיע עד...

⁹ Above . is written an א, i. e. כאלה.

¹⁰ Above א is written ., i.e. שאת.

Oxford Heb. d 63

- 10a נתעברה השנה [...] סוף אדר עד סוף אדר הנראשון ח רבי Ned. 87.8
יהודה אומר קונם יין שאני טועם עד שיהא הפסח אינו אסור
אולא עד לילי הפסח שלא נתכוון זה אילא עד שעה שדרך
9 בנ׳ אדם לשנות יין ט אמר וקונם בשר שאני טועם עד שיהא
הצום אינו אסור אילא עד לילי הצום שלא נתכוון זה אילא
10 עד שעה שדרך בני אדם לוכל בשר י רבי יוסי בנו אמר
אמר קונם ושום שאני טועם עד שתהא השבת אינו אסור אילא
עד לילי שבת שלא נתכוון זה אילא עד שעה שדרך בני אדם
11 לוכל שום יא האומר לחבירו קונם שאני נהנה ולך אם אין
אתה בא ונוטל לבניך כור אחד שלחטים ושתי חביות ושלזין הרי
זה יכול להפר את נדרו שלא על פי חכם ואמר לו כלום
אמרתה לי אלא מפני כבודי וזה הוא כבודי וכן האומר
ולחבירו קונם שאני נהנה לי אם אין אתה נותן לבני וכור
אחד שלחטים ושתי חביות ושלזין רבי מאיר אומר אסור עד
שיתן וחכמים ואומרים אף זה יכול להפר את נדרו שלא על פי
12 חכם ויאמר לו הרי אני כאלו נהנתין בזה היו מסרבים בו
לשאת את בת אחת ואמר קונם שהיא נהנת לי ולעולם וכן
המגרש את אשתו ואמר קונם אשתי נהנת לי לעולם הרי אלו
13 מותרות ומלהנות לו שלא נתכוון זה אילא לשם אישות יג היה
מסריב בחבירו שיאכל ואצלו אמר קונם לביתך שאני נכנס
וטיפת צונן שאני טועם לך מותר להיכנס ולביתו ולשתות ממנו
צונן שלא נתכוון זה אלא לשם אכילה ושתייה והנא פרקא ח
הלכתא יג פרקא ט רבי אליעזר ואומר פותחים לאדם בכבוד
9 1 אביו ואמו וחכמים אוסרים אמר ...

שליין MS.

10b ... וְרַבִּי מֵאִירָא אָמַר יֵשׁ דְּבָרִים שְׁהֵן ... כְּאִיזָה צַד
 אִמְרוּ קֹנֵם שְׁאֵנִי נוֹשֵׂא אֶת פְּלוֹנוֹנִית שְׁאִבִּיהָ רַע אִמְרוּ
 לוֹ מֵת אוֹ שְׁעִשָּׂה תְּשׁוּבָה קֹנֵם לְבוֹיָתָ הִזֵּה שְׁאֵנִי נִכְנָס
 שְׂכָלָב רָע בְּתוֹכִי ... שְׁנֵהֲרֹג הַנֶּחֱשׁ הָרִי הֵן כְּנוֹלָד וְאֵינִן כְּנוֹלָד
 וְאֵין [. . . דְּ . . .] פּוֹתְחִים לוֹ מִן הַכְּתוּב שְׁבִתוֹרָה וְאִמְרִים לוֹ
 [. . .] וְעַל לֹא תִטֹּר וְעַל לֹא תִשְׁנֶא אֶת אַחֶיךָ בְּלִבְכָּךְ וְנִאֲהַבְתָּ . . .
 יַעֲנֵי וְאֵין אֹתָהּ יָכוֹל לִפְרֹנְסוֹ וְאִמְרָ אֵילוֹ יוֹדֵעַ נֵאִנִּי שְׁהוּא בֶן לֹא
 הֵייתִי נוֹדֵר הָרִי זֶה מוֹתֵר הֵּ פּוֹתְחִים לְאָדָם בְּכַתּוּבָתָּ אִשְׁתּוּ
 מַעֲשֶׂה בְּאַחַד וְשִׁנְדֵּר מֵאִשְׁתּוֹ הִנָּה וְהִיתָה כְּתוּבָתָה אֲרִבְעָ מֵאוֹת
 זֹו וּבִאֲתָ לִפְנֵי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה וְחִיבּוֹ לִיתֵן נְלָה כְּתוּבָתָה אִמְרָ לוֹ
 רַבִּי שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת דִּינָר הִינִיחַ אֲבָהָ נָטַל אַחִי אֲרִבְעָ מֵאוֹת וְאֵנִי
 וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת לֹא דִיָּה שְׁתִּישׁוּל הִיא מֵאֲתִים וְאֵנִי מֵאֲתִים אִמְרָ
 לוֹ רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה אֲפִילוֹ אֵתָה מוֹכֵר שְׁעָרִי רֵאשֶׁךְ אֹתָהּ נוֹתֵן לָהּ
 כְּתוּבָתָה וְאִמְרָ אֵילוֹ הֵייתִי יוֹדֵעַ שְׁהוּא כֵּן לֹא נְהִייתִי נוֹדֵר
 וְהִתִּירוּ רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה וְ פּוֹתְחִים בְּיָמִים טוֹבִים וּבְשִׁבְתּוֹת בְּרֵאשׁוֹנוֹה
 הִיוּ אוֹמְרִים אוֹתָן הֵימִים מוֹתְרִים וְשֵׁאֲרָ כָּל הֵימִים אֲסוּרִים עַד
 שְׁבָא רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה נוֹלִימֵד שְׂכָל נִדָּר שְׁהוֹתֵר מְכַלְלוֹ הוֹתֵר כּוֹלוֹ
 וְ כְּאִיזָה צַד אִמְרָ קֹנֵם שְׁנִי וְנִהְנֶה לְכַלְכֵּם הוֹתֵר אַחַד מֵהֶם
 הוֹתֵרוּ כּוֹלֵם שְׁאֵנִי נִהְנֶה לֹזֶה וְלֹזֶה הוֹתֵר הִרְאִשׁוֹן וְהוֹתֵר כּוֹלֵם
 הוֹתֵר הָאֲחֵרוֹן הָאֲחֵרוֹן מוֹתֵר וְכוֹלֵם אֲסוּרִים שְׁאֵנִי נִהְנֶה לֹזֶה
 קִרְבָּן וְלֹזֶה קִרְבָּן צְרִיכִים פְּתַח כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד חֵ קֹנֵם יֵין
 וְשֵׁאִנִּי טוֹעֵם שְׁהֵיִן רָע לְמִיעִים אִמְרוּ לוֹ וְהָרִי הַמִּיּוֹשֵׁן יִפְנֶה
 לְמַעִים הוֹתֵר בְּמִיּוֹשֵׁן וְלֹא בְּמִיּוֹשֵׁן בְּלִבְדִּי הוֹתֵר אֵילוֹ בְּכָל הַיּוֹיִן
 קֹנֵם בְּצֹל שְׁאֵנִי טוֹעֵם שְׁהִבְצֹל רָע לָלֵב אִמְרוּ לוֹ וְהִלֵּא . . .

Cambr. E 1,90

- a [ט... ובכבוד בניו ואומרים לו אוילו... שלפלוני מגדש את נשיו ועל בנותיך... שלאילו להיתגרש ואמר אילו הייתי נ... 10
 קונם שני נושא את פלונית כאורה והרי היא נ... היא ארוכה לא מפני שהיא כאורא ונעשית נאה נ... ארוכה אלא שהנדר טאעות מעשה באחד שנדר ומבת... לבית רבי ישמעאל ויפוח אמר לו רבי ישמעאל בני מיזו נדרת... ישמעאל באותה שעה בכך רבי ישמעאל ואמר נ... מנולתן יא וכשמת רבי ישמעאל היו בנות ישראל נ... בנות ישראל על רבי ישמעאל בכינה וכן הוא אומר בנות ישראל על נשאל בכינה וגו' הנה פרקא ט הלכתא יא פרקא י נערה המאורסה אביה ובעלה מפירים 10 1
 נ... הבצל ולא הפך האב אינו מופך אין צורך לומר שיקים 2
 נ... ב... רשות לבצל מת הבצל נתרוקנה רשות לאב בזה 3
 נ... יפה כוח הבצל מכוח האב שהבצל מפיך בבגר והאב 4
 נ... ג... נתגרשה בו ביום נתארסה בו ביום אפילו למאה 5
 נ... כל שלא יצאת לרשות עצמה שעה אחת אביה 6
 נ... דרך תלמידי חכמים עד שלא היתה בתו יוצאה נ... בינתי 7
 הרי הן מופרים וכן הבצל עד שלא נ... עד שלא תיכנס לרשותי הרי הן מופרים נ... ה' בוגרת ששהת שנים עשר חדש ואלמנה נ... במונותיה יפר וחכמים אומרים אין הבצל נ... ו שומרת יבם בין יבם אחד בין שני יבמים רבי אליעזר נ... רבי עמיבא אומר לא לאחד ולא לשנים אמר נ... הוא מפר נדריה ואשה שקנו לו שמים נ... אם אומרתה באשה שקנה הוא לעצמו שאין נ... שיש לאחירים בה רשות אמר לו רבי נ... משיב על יבם אחד אמר לו אין היבמה נ... ו האומר לאשתו כל נדרים שתדורי...

מפירים. MS.

- b . . . וחכמים אומרים אוניו מופר ח' . . . לא יפר נדרים Ned. 10
 שלא באו לכלל אויסור. . . בא לכלל הפר לא בא לכלל
 הקם לא בא ולכלל הפר ט' . . . להקלו ולהחמיר כאיזה צד 9
 נדרה בלילי שבת מופר . . . עם חשיכה מפר עד שלא תחשך
 שאם לא היפר . . . הנא פרקא י' הלכתא ט' פרקא יא' . . . עניו 11 1
 נפש אם ארחץ אם לא ארחץ אם אתקשט אם ולא. . . עניו
 נפש ב' אילו הן נדרי עניו נפש אמרה קונם פירות . . . פירות 2
 המדינה זו עלי יבא לה ממדינה אחרת פירות החנואני זה
 עלי אינו יכול להפר אם לא היתה פרנסתו אלא ממנו הרי
 זה יפר דברי רבי יוסה ג' קונם שנאני ניהנת לבריות אינו יכול 3
 להפר יכול הוא ליהנות בלקט ובשכחה ובפיאה קונם כהנים
 ווליים נהנים לי יטלו על כורחן כהנים אילו לויים אילו נהנים
 ל³ יטלו אחרים ד' קונם שאני עושה על פי אבא ועל פי אבין 4
 על פי אחי על פי אחיך אינו יכול להפר שני עושה ועל פיך
 אינו צריך להפר רבי עקיבה אומר יפר שמא תעדיף עליו
 יתיר מיהראוי לו נרבי יוחנן בן נורי אומר יפר שמא יגרשנה
 ותהא אסורה לחזור לו ה' נדרה אשתו וסבור שנדרה בתו נדרה 5
 בתו וסבור שנדרה אשתו נדרה בנויר וסבור שנדרה בקורבן
 נדרה בקורבן וסבור שנדרה בנויר נדרה מן התאנים וסבור
 שנדרה מן הענבים מן הענבים וסבור שנדרה מן התאנים הרי
 זה יחזור ויפר ו' אמרה קונם תאנים וענבים אילו שאני טועמת 6
 קיים לתאנים כולו קיים היפר לתאנים אינו מופר עוד שיפר

* אלא missing, added on margin.

³ לי above the line.

Ned. 11 6

7

8

9

אף לענבים אמרה קונם לתאינה שאנין טועמ'ת עינב שני טועמ'ת
הרי אינלו שני נדרים ו יודע אני שיש נדרים אבל איני יודע
שיש מפירים יפר יודע אני שיש מפירים אבל איני יודע שזה
נדר רבין מאיר אומר לא יפר וחכמים אומרים ויפר ה המודר
הנאה מחתנו והוא רוצה לתת לבתו מעות אומר לה הרי המעות
האילו ננתונים לך מתנה ובלבד שלא יהא לבעליך רשותו
בהם אילא מה שאת נותנת בפיך ט נדר אלמנה וגרושה יקום
עליה כאיזה צד אמרה הריני נזירה לאחר שלשים יום אף על
פי שנשאת בתוך שלשים יום אינו יכול להפר נזירה והיא ברשות
הבעל והיפר נלה כאיזה צד אמרה הריני נזירה לאחר שלשים
יום אף על פי שנתאלמנה או נתגרשה בתוך שלשים יום הרי
זה מופר נדרה בו ביום ונתגרשה בו ביום והחזירה בו ביום אינו
יכול להפר כל שניצאת לרשות עצמה...

Leningrad Ant. 483a

'Edujot

- 1a אמר לו מעשיך יקרבוך ומעשיך ירחקוך הנא פרקא ה הלכתא ט 5 9
פורקא ו רבי יהודה בן אבא היעיד חמשה דברים שממאנים 6 1
את הקטנות ושמסאינים אתו האשה על פי עד אחד ושנסקל
תרגול בירושלם שהרג את הנפש ועל הינין בן ארבעים שנתנסך
על גבי המזבח ועל תמיד שלשחר שקרב בארבע שעות ובו היעיד 2
רבי יהושע ורבי נחמיה בן אלנן איש כפר הבבלי על איבר
מן המית ושהוא טמא שרבי אליעזר אומר לא אמרו אילא על
איבר מן החי ג אמרו לו והלא קול וחומר הוא מה אם החי 3
שהוא טהור איבר הפורש ממנו טמא המית ושהוא טמא אינו
דין שיהא איבר הפורש ממנו טמא אמר להם לא אמרו אילא

אִיבְרוּ מִן הַחַיִּי דְּרַבֵּר אַחֵר מְרֻבָּה טוֹמֵאֵת הַחַיִּים מְטוֹמֵאֵת
 הַמֵּתִים שֶׁהָיָה עוֹשֶׂה נִמְשָׁכָה וּמִשְׁכָּה מִתַּחַתָּיו לְטֵמֵא אֶדָם וּלְטֵמֵא
 בְּדָדִים עַל גִּבּוֹ מִדָּף לְטֵמֵא אוֹכְלִים וּמִשְׁקִים מִה שֶׁאֵין הַמֵּת
 מְטֵמֵא הֵ כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מֵאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מְטֵמֵא
 וּרְבִי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וּרְבִי נְחוֹנִיָּה מְטַהֲרִים עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מֵאִיבֵר
 מִן הַחַיִּי רַבִּי נְחוֹנִיָּה מְטֵמֵא וּרְבִי אֱלִיעֶזֶר וּרְבִי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ מְטַהֲרִים
 וְ אִמְרוּ לוֹ לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מִה רְאִיתָה לְטֵמֵא כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ
 מֵאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי אָמַר לָהֶם מֵאֲצִינוּ שְׂאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי כִּמֵּת שְׁלֵם
 מִה הַמֵּת כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ טֵמֵא וְאָף אִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי כְּזֹת
 יִבְשֶׁר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ יִהְיֶה טֵמֵא אִמְרוּ לוֹ לֹא אִם טִימִיתָה כְּזֹת
 בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הַמֵּת שְׂכִין טִיְהִרְתָּה עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ
 תְטַמֵּא כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מֵאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי שְׂכִין טִיְהִרְתָּה עֶצֶם
 כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ וּמִמֶּנּוּ זֶ אִמְרוּ לוֹ לְרַבִּי נְחוֹנִיָּה מִה רְאִיתָה
 לְטֵמֵא עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מֵאִיבֵר מִן נְחִי אָמַר לָהֶם מֵאֲצִינוּ
 שְׂאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי כִּמֵּת שְׁלֵם מִה הַמֵּת עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ
 טֵמֵא וְאָף אִיבְרוּ מִן הַחַיִּי עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ יִהְיֶה טֵמֵא
 אִמְרוּ לוֹ לֹא אִם טִימִיתָה עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִן הַמֵּת שְׂכִין
 טִיְהִרְתָּה כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ תְטַמֵּא עֶצֶם כַּסְעוֹרָה הַפּוֹרֵשׁ
 מֵאִיבֵר מִן הַחַיִּי שְׂכִין טִיְהִרְתָּה כְּזֹת בָּשָׂר הַפּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ הֵ אִמְרוּ
 לוֹ לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מִה רְאִיתָה לְחִלּוֹק מִדִּתְךָ אוֹ טֵמֵא בִשְׁנֵיהֶם
 אוֹ טְהִיר בִּשְׁנֵיהֶם אָמַר לָהֶם מְרֻבָּה טוֹמֵאֵת הַבָּשָׂר מְטוֹמֵאֵת
 הָעֶצָמוֹת שֶׁהַבָּשָׂר נֹוגֵעַ בְּנִבְלֹת וּבִשְׂרָצִים מִה שֶׁאֵין כֵּאֵן בְּעֶצְמוֹת
 דְּבָר אַחֵר אִיבֵר שֵׁשׁ עָלָיו בָּשָׂר כִּרְאוֹי מְטֵמֵא בְּמֹעַ וּבִמְשָׂא

¹ The copyist had written טמא and corrected it by writing בשר without vowels, over the line.

'Edujot 69

ובאהיל חסר הבשר טמא חסר העצם טהור ט אמרו לו לרבי
 נחניה מה ראיתך לחלוק מידתך או טמא בשניהם או טהור
 בשניהם אמר להם מרובה טומאת העצמות מוטמאת הבשר
 שהבשר והפורש מן החי טהור ואיבר הפורש ממנו והוא כבריתו
 טמא דבר אחר כזית בשר מטמא ובמגע ובמשא ובאהיל ורוב
 העצמות מטמאים במגע ובמשא ובאהיל חסר הבשר טהור חסר
 רוב העצמות אף על פי שטהר מילטמא באהיל מטמא במגע
 ובמשא דבר אחר וכל בשר המת שהוא פחות מכזית טהור
 רוב בינינו ורוב מנינו שלמת אף על פי שאין נבחן רובע טמאים
 י אמרו לרבי יהושע מה ראיתך לטהר בשניהם אמר להם
 לא ואם אמרתם במת שיש בו רוב ורובע ורקב תאמרו בחי
 שאין בו רוב ורובע ורקב והנא פרקא ו הלכתא י פרקא ו היעיד
 רבי יהושע ורבי צדוק על פדיון פטר חמור [שמת] שאין כאן
 לכהן כלום שרבי אליעזר אומר חיבין באחריותו כחמש סלעים
 שלבן וחכמים ואומרים אין חיב באחריותו כפדיון מעשר שני
 ב היעיד רבי צדוק על ציר חגבים [וטמאים] שהוא טהור שהמשנה
 הראשונה חגבים טמאים שכבשן עם חגבים טהורים לא ופסלו
 את צירן ג היעיד רבי צדוק על הזוחלים שרבו על הנוטפים
 שהן כשרים מעשה והיה בבירת פליא ובא מעשה לפני חכמים
 והתירו ד היעיד רבי צדוק על הזוחלים שקילחן בעלי אגוז
 שהן כשרים מעשה היה באהליה ובא מעשה ללשכת הגזית
 והכשירו ה היעיד רבי יהושע ורבי יקים איש חדיד על קלל
 שלחטאת שנתנו על גבי השרץ שהוא טמא שרבי אליעזר מטהר
 היעיד רבי פפיס על מי שנזר שתי נזירות שאם גילח את הראשונה

* Cf. Lowe.

יום שלשים מגלח את השנייה יום ששים ואם גילח יום ששים 'Edujot
 חסר אחר יצא שיום שלשים עולה לו מן המנין ו היעיד רבי 6
 יהושע ורבי פפס על ולד שלמים שיקרב שלמים שלמים אמר
 רבי פפס אני מעיד שהיתה לנו פרה זבחי שלמים ואכלנוהא
 בפסח ואכלנו נאת ולדהו שלמים בחג ו הן היעידו על ארוכות 7
 שלנחתומים שהן טמאות שרבי אליעזר ומטהרן הן היעידו על
 תנור שחיתכו חליות ונתן חול בין חליא לחליא שהוא טמא
 ושרבי אליעזר מטהר הן היעידו שמעבירים את השנה כל אדר
 שהיו אומרים עד נהפורים הן היעידו שמעבירים את השנה על
 תנאי ה מעשה ברבן גמליאל שהלך לישול רשות מהגמון שבסוריה 8
 ושהא לבוא ועיברו את השנה על תנאי כשירצה רבן גמליאל
 וכשבא אמר להם רוצה אני ונמצאת השנה מעוברת ט היעיד
 מנחם בן סיגוי על מוסף יורה שלשולקי זיתים שהוא טמא ועל
 שלצבעים שהוא טהור שהיו אומרים חילוף הדברים היעיד
 רבי יוחנן בן גודגדה על החרשת שהיסיאה אביה שהיא יוצאה
 בגט ועל קטנה בת ישראל שנישאת לכהן שהיא אוכלת בתרומה
 ואם מיתה בעלה יורשה ועל המריש הגזול שבנאו בבירה שיתן
 את דמיו ועל החטאת הגזולה שלא נודעה לרבים שהיא מכפרת
 מפני תיקון המזבח הנא פרקא ו הלכתא ט פרקא ה היעיד 8 1
 רבי יהושע בן בתירה על דם נבלת שהוא טהור היעיד רבי
 שמעון בן בתירה על איפר חטאת שנגע טמא במיקצתו שטימא
 את כולו הוסיף ורביו עקיבה הסולת והקטרת והלבונה והגחלים
 שנגע טבול יום במקצתם שפסל ואתן כולם ב היעיד רבי יהודה 2
 בן אבא ורבי יהודה הכהן על קטנה בת ישראל שנישאת

³ The further discussion with R. Eliezer is missing here.

2a

סידרא דחמשה קדשים וזבחים פרקא קדמא כל הִזְבָּחִים שְׁנוּבְחוּ
 1 1 שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן כְּשִׁירִים אִילָא שְׁלֹא עָלוּ לִבְעָלִים לִשְׁם חֻבָּה חוץ
 מִן הַפֶּסֶחַ וּמִן הַחֲטָאֹת הַפֶּסֶחַ בּוֹמְנֵי וְהַחֲטָאֹת בְּכָל זֶמֶן רַבִּי
 אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר אִף הָאֲשֶׁם הַפֶּסֶחַ בּוֹמְנֵי וְהַחֲטָאֹת וְהָאֲשֶׁם בְּכָל זֶמֶן
 אֱמֵר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר חֲטָאֹת בָּאָה עַל חֹט וְאֲשֶׁם בָּא עַל חֹט מָה
 2 חֲטָאֹת פְּסוּלָה שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמָהּ וְאִף אֲשֶׁם פְּסוּל שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמוֹ בִּיּוֹסֵה
 בֶּן חֹנִי אוֹמֵר הַנִּשְׁחָטִים לִשְׁם פֶּסֶחַ וְלִשְׁם חֲטָאֹת פְּסוּלִים שִׁמְעוּן
 אַחֵי עֲזַרְיָה אוֹמֵר שְׁחָטָן לִשְׁם גְּבוּהָ מֵהֶם כְּשִׁירִים וְלִשְׁם נִמּוֹךְ
 3 מֵהֶם פְּסוּלִים גַּם כְּאִיּוֹהָ צֵד קוֹדֵשִׁי קוֹדֵשִׁים שְׁחָטָן לִשְׁם קִדְּשִׁים
 קָלִים פְּסוּלִים וְקִדְּשִׁים קָלִים שְׁחָטָן לִשְׁם קוֹדֵשִׁי קִדְּשִׁים כְּשִׁירִים
 הַבְּכוֹר וְהַמַּעֲשֵׂר שְׁחָטָן לִשְׁם שְׁלָמִים כְּשִׁירִים וְשְׁלָמִים שְׁחָטָן
 4 לִשְׁם בְּכוֹר וְלִשְׁם מַעֲשֵׂר פְּסוּלִים דִּן הַפֶּסֶחַ⁴ שְׁחָטָנוּ שְׁחָרִית
 בְּאַרְבַּעָה שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמוֹ רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ מְכַשִּׁיר כִּי לֹא נִשְׁחָט בְּשִׁלְשָׁה
 עָשָׂר בֶּן בְּתִירָה פּוֹסֵל כִּי לֹא נִשְׁחָט בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם אֱמֵר שִׁמְעוּן
 בֶּן עֲזַאי מְקוּבֵּל אֲנִי מִפִּי שְׁבָעִים וּשְׁנַיִם זָקֵן בְּיוֹם שֶׁהוֹשִׁיבוּ אֹת
 רַבִּי לַעֲזוֹר בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה בִּישִׁיבָה שְׁכָל הַזְּבָחִים הִנָּכְלִים שְׁנוּבְחוּ שְׁלֹא
 לִשְׁמֹן כְּשִׁירִים אִילָא שְׁלֹא עָלוּ לִבְעָלִים לִשְׁם חֻבָּה חוץ מִן
 הַפֶּסֶחַ וּמִן הַחֲטָאֹת וְלֹא הוֹסִיף בֶּן עֲזַאי אִילָא עוֹלָה וְלֹא הוֹדוּ
 5 לוֹ חֲכָמִים הֵן הַפֶּסֶחַ וְהַחֲטָאֹת שְׁחָטָן שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן קִיבֵּל וְהִלֵּךְ
 וּדְרָק שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן אוֹ לִשְׁמֹן אוֹ שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן וְלִשְׁמֹן פְּסוּלִים כְּאִיּוֹהָ
 צֵד לִשְׁמֹן וְשְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן לִשְׁם הַפֶּסֶחַ וְלִשְׁם שְׁלָמִים וְשְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן
 6 וְלִשְׁמֹן לִשְׁם שְׁלָמִים וְלִשְׁם הַפֶּסֶחַ וְשֶׁהֻזְכַּר נִפְסֵל בְּאַרְבַּעָה
 דְּבָרִים בְּשִׁחִיטָהּ וּבְקִיבּוּל וּבְהִילּוֹךְ וּבְזִיקָהּ רַבִּי שִׁמְעוּן מְכַשִּׁיר

⁴ At first written טו".

בְּהִילוֹךְ שֶׁהָיָה רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר אִפְשָׁר שְׁלֹא בִשְׁחִיטָהּ וּשְׁלֹא
 בְּקִבְלָהּ וּשְׁלֹא בִזְרִיקָה אֲבָל אִפְשָׁר שְׁלֹא בְּהִילוֹךְ שׁוֹחֵט בְּצֶדֶךְ
 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְזוֹרֵק רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר אִךְ הִמָּהֵלֶךְ לַמָּקוֹם שֶׁהוּא
 צָרִיךְ לַהֲלֹךְ הַמַּחֲשָׁבָה פּוֹסֵלָתָּ וּמָקוֹם שֶׁאֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ לַהֲלֹךְ אֵין
 הַמַּחֲשָׁבָה פּוֹסֵלָתָּ הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק א קדמא הִלְכְתָּא וְ פֶּרֶק ב כָּל
 הַזִּבְחִים שֶׁקִּיבַל דָּמָן זָר אוֹנֵן טָבוֹל יוֹם וּמְחוֹסֵר בְּנֵדִים וּמְחוֹסֵר
 כְּפוּרִים וּשְׁלֹא רַחוּץ יָדַיִם וְרִגְלַיִם עָרֵל טָמֵא יוֹשֵׁב עוֹמֵד עַל
 גְּבִי כְלִים וְעַל גְּבִי בְּהֵמָה וְעַל גְּבִי רִגְלֵי חֲבִירוֹ פָּסֹל קִיבַל
 בְּשִׁמְאוֹל פָּסֹל רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן מִכְשִׁיר נִשְׁפָּךְ עַל הָרִצְפָּה וְאִסְפוּ
 פָּסוּל נִתְּנוּ עַל גְּבִי הַכֶּבֶשׂ שְׁלֹא כִנְגֵד הַיִּסּוּד נִתָּן אֶת הַנִּיתָנִים
 מִלִּמָּטָה לִמָּעַל וְאֶת הַנִּיתָנִים מִלִּמָּעַל לִמָּטָן וְאֶת הַנִּיתָנִים מִיבִיפְנִים
 בְּחוּץ וְאֶת הַנִּיתָנִים מִבְּחוּץ בְּפָנִים פָּסוּל וְאֵין בּוֹ כֶּרֶת בַּהֲשׁוּחֵט
 אֶת הַזֶּבֶחַ לְזֶרוֹק דָּמוֹ בְּחוּץ אוֹ מִקְצֵת דָּמוֹ בְּחוּץ לַהֲקָטִיר אֱמֹרָיו
 בְּחוּץ אוֹ מִקְצֵת אֱמֹרָיו בְּחוּץ לְאוֹכֵל בִּשְׂרוֹ בְּחוּץ אוֹ וּכְזִיתוֹ
 מִבִּשְׂרוֹ בְּחוּץ אוֹ לְאוֹכֵל כֹּזֵית מֵעוֹר הָאֱלִיָּה בְּחוּץ פָּסוּל וְאֵין בּוֹ
 כֶּרֶת גַּ לְזֶרוֹק דָּמוֹ לִמָּחֵר אוֹ מִקְצֵת דָּמוֹ לִמָּחֵר לַהֲקָטִיר אֱמֹרָיו
 לִמָּחֵר אוֹ מִקְצֵת אֱמֹרָיו לִמָּחֵר לְאוֹכֵל בִּשְׂרוֹ לִמָּחֵר אוֹ מִקְצֵת
 בִּשְׂרוֹ לִמָּחֵר אוֹ לְאוֹכֵל כֹּזֵית מֵעוֹר הָאֱלִיָּה לִמָּחֵר פִּיגּוּל וְחִיבִים
 עָלָיו כֶּרֶת דַּ זֶּה כָּלֹל כֹּל הַשּׁוֹחֵט וְהַמְקַבֵּל וְהַמָּהֵלֶךְ וְהַזּוֹרֵק
 לְאוֹכֵל דָּבָר שֶׁדָּרְכוֹ לְאוֹכֵל וְלַהֲקָטִיר דָּבָר שֶׁדָּרְכוֹ לַהֲקָטִיר חוּץ
 לַמָּקוֹמוֹ פָּסוּל וְאֵין בּוֹ כֶּרֶת חוּץ לִזְמַנּוֹ פִּיגּוּל וְחִיבִים עָלָיו כֶּרֶת
 וּבִלְבָד שֶׁיִּקְרָב הַמִּתּוֹר כְּמִצּוֹתוֹ הֵ כְּאִיזָה צֶדֶד קָרֵב הַמִּתּוֹר כְּמִצּוֹתוֹ
 שֶׁחָט בשְׁתִּיקָה קִיבַל וְהִילָךְ וּזְרָק חוּץ לִזְמַנּוֹ אוֹ שֶׁחָט חוּץ לִזְמַנּוֹ
 קִיבַל וְהִילָךְ וּזְרָק בשְׁתִּיקָה אוֹ שֶׁחָט וְקִיבַל וְהִילָךְ וּזְרָק בשְׁתִּיקָה

2 1

2

3

4

5

2b

זֶה הוּא שְׁקָרָב הַמַּתִּיר כְּמַצּוֹתוֹ וְכַאֲיִזָּה צָד לֹא קָרָב הַמַּתִּיר
 כְּמַצּוֹתוֹ שֶׁחֵט חוּץ לַמִּקְוֵה קִיבֵּל וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ חוּץ לִזְמָנוֹ אוֹ
 שֶׁשָּׁחַט חוּץ לִזְמָנוֹ קִיבֵּל וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ חוּץ לַמִּקְוֵה אוֹ שֶׁשָּׁחַט
 וְקִיבֵּל וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ חוּץ לַמִּקְוֵה הַפֶּסֶחַ וְהַחֲטָאִת שֶׁשָּׁחַט שְׁלֹא
 לִשְׁמֵן קִיבֵּל וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ חוּץ לִזְמָנוֹ אוֹ שֶׁשָּׁחַט חוּץ לִזְמָנוֹ וְקִיבֵּל
 וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֵן אוֹ שֶׁשָּׁחַט וְקִיבֵּל וְהִילֵךְ וּרְקָ שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֵן
 זֶה הוּא שְׁלֹא קָרָב הַמַּתִּיר כְּמַצּוֹתוֹ וְלֹא אוֹכֵל כֹּזֵית בַּחוּץ כֹּזֵית
 לַמֶּחֶר כֹּזֵית לַמֶּחֶר כֹּזֵית בַּחוּץ כֹּחֲצִי זֵית בַּחוּץ כֹּחֲצִי זֵית לַמֶּחֶר
 כֹּחֲצִי זֵית לַמֶּחֶר כֹּחֲצִי זֵית בַּחוּץ פָּסוּל וְאֵין בּוֹ כֶּרֶת הֵאָמַר
 רַבִּי יְהוּדָה זֶה כֹּלֵל אִם מַחֲשַׁבֵּת הִזְמִין קִדְמָה לַמַּחֲשַׁבֵּת הַמָּקוֹם
 פִּיגוּל וְחִיבִים עָלָיו כֶּרֶת וְאִם מַחֲשַׁבֵּת הַמָּקוֹם קִדְמָה לַמַּחֲשַׁבֵּת
 הִזְמִין פָּסוּל וְאֵין בּוֹ כֶּרֶת וְחֹכְמִים אוֹמְרִים זֶה וְזֶה פָּסוּל וְאֵין
 בּוֹ כֶּרֶת לֹא אוֹכֵל כֹּחֲצִי זֵית וְלֹהֲקֵטִיר כֹּחֲצִי זֵית כֹּשֶׁר שְׁאִין אֹכִילָהּ
 וְהִקְטִירָהּ מִצְטָרְפִים הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק אֵ בְּהִלְכָתָא הֵאָמַר פֶּרֶק אֵ גַּלְיָה
 הַפָּסוּלִים שֶׁשָּׁחֲטוּ שְׁחִיטָתָן כְּשֶׁרָה שֶׁהִשְׁחִיטָה כְּשֶׁרָה בְּזָרִים בְּנָשִׁים
 וּבַעֲבָדִים וּבְטַמְאִים אֶפִּילוֹ בְּקוֹדֶשֶׁי קִדְשִׁים וּבִלְבָד שְׁלֹא יִהְיֶה
 טַמְאִים נוֹגְעִים בְּבָשָׂר לִפְיֵי כֹךְ הֵן פָּסוּלִים בְּמַחֲשַׁבֵּה וְכוּלָם
 שֶׁקִּיבְלוּ אֶת הָדָם חוּץ לִזְמָנוֹ וְחוּץ לַמִּקְוֵה אִם יֵשׁ דָּם הַנֶּפֶשׁ
 יַחְזוֹר הַכֹּשֶׁר וְיִקְבֵּל בֵּי קִיבֵּל הַכֹּשֶׁר וְנִתֵּן לַפָּסוּל יַחְזוֹר לַכֹּשֶׁר
 קִיבֵּל בִּימִינוֹ וְנִתֵּן לִשְׁמָאלוֹ יַחְזוֹר לִימִינוֹ קִיבֵּל בְּכֻלֵּי קוֹדֶשׁ וְנִתֵּן
 לְכֻלֵּי חוּל יַחְזוֹר לְכֻלֵּי קוֹדֶשׁ נִשְׁפָּךְ מִן הַכֵּלִי עַל הָרִצְפָּה וְאִסְפוּ
 כֹּשֶׁר נִתְּנוּ עַל גְּבֵי הַכֶּבֶשׂ שְׁלֹא כְּנֶגֶד הַיִּסּוּד נִתֵּן אֶת הַנִּיתָנִים

⁵ MS. פָּסוּלִים.

⁶ In the margin: וְיִקְבֵּל.

מִלְמַטָּה לַמַּעֲלָה וְאֵת הַנִּיתָנִים מִלְמַעֲלָה לַמַּטָּן וְאֵת הַנִּיתָנִים Zebahim
 מִבִּיפְנִים בַּחוּץ וְאֵת הַנִּיתָנִים מִבְּחוּץ בְּפָנִים אִם יֵשׁ דָּם הַנֶּפֶשׁ
 יִחוּזֹר הַכֶּשֶׁר וְיִקָּבֵל ג' הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַזֶּבֶחַ לְאוֹכֵל דָּבָר שֶׁאֵין 3
 דִּרְכוֹ לְאוֹכֵל וְלִהְיֶטֶר דָּבָר שֶׁאֵין דִּרְכוֹ לִהְיֶטֶר כֶּשֶׁר רָבִי
 אֱלִיעֶזֶר פּוֹסֵל לְאוֹכֵל דָּבָר שֶׁדִּרְכוֹ לְאוֹכֵל וְלִהְיֶטֶר דָּבָר שֶׁדִּרְכוֹ
 לִהְיֶטֶר פָּחוֹת מִכּוֹזֵית כֶּשֶׁר לְאוֹכֵל כַּחֲצִי זֵית * וְלִהְיֶטֶר כַּחֲצִי 4
 זֵית כֶּשֶׁר שֶׁאֵין אֹכִילָה וְהִקְטֵרָה מִצִּטְרֵי ד' הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַזֶּבֶחַ
 לְאוֹכֵל כְּזֵית מִן הָעוֹר מִן הָרוֹטֵב מִן הַקּוֹפֶה מִן הָאֵלֶּל מִן הָעֲצָמוֹת
 מִן הַגִּידִים מִן הַקֶּרְנִים וּמִן הַטְּלָפִיִּים כֶּשֶׁר וְאֵין חֵיִיבִים עָלֵיהֶם
 מִשֶּׁם פִּיגוּל וְנוֹתֵר וְטֵמֵא ה' הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַמּוֹקְדָּשִׁים לְאוֹכֵל שְׁלִיל 5
 אוֹ שְׁלִיא בַחוּץ לֹא פִיגֵל הַמּוֹלֵק אֶת הַתֵּרִין בְּפָנִים לְאוֹכֵל
 בִּצְיָהֶם בַּחוּץ לֹא פִיגֵל חֵלֶב מוֹקְדָּשִׁים וּבִצְיָ תֵרִין אֵין חֵיִיבִים
 עָלֵיהֶם מִשֶּׁם פִּיגוּל וְנוֹתֵר וְטֵמֵא ו' שֶׁחָטוּ עַל מִנֵּה לִהְיֵה דָמוֹ אוֹ 6
 אֶת אֲמֹרָיו לְמַחֵר אוֹ לְהוֹצִיאוֹ לַחוּץ רָבִי יְהוּדָה פּוֹסֵל וְחֲכָמִים
 מְכַשְׁרִים שֶׁחָטוּ עַל מִנֵּה לִיתְנוֹ עַל גְּבִי הַכֶּבֶשׂ שְׁלֹא כִנּוֹד הִסּוּד
 בַּחוּץ בְּפָנִים לַמַּטָּן לַמַּעֲלָה וְאֵת הַנִּיתָנִים לַמַּעֲלָה לַמַּטָּן וְאֵת
 הַנִּיתָנִים בְּפָנִים בַּחוּץ וְאֵת הַנִּיתָנִים בַּחוּץ בְּפָנִים שִׁאֲכִילוּהוּ
 טֵמֵאִים שִׁקְרִיבוּהוּ טֵמֵאִים שִׁאֲכִילוּהוּ עֲרִילִים שִׁקְרִיבוּהוּ עֲרִילִים
 לְשֹׁבֵר עֲצָמוֹת הַפֶּסַח וְלְאוֹכֵל מִמֶּנּוּ נֹא לַעֲרֹב דָּמוֹ בְּדָם פְּסוּלִים
 כֶּשֶׁר שֶׁאֵין הַמַּחֲשֶׁבֶה פּוֹסֵלֵת אֵילֹא נָחוּץ לִזְמֵנוּ ...

* מִזֵּית is added here and deleted.

* יר above the line.

* Sic!

Oxford Heb. c 17

From this MS. fol. 35a–38a, containing the text of Nidda 9^a till the end of Maškim, have been published by Ch. B. Friedmann in his thesis: "Zur Geschichte der ältesten Mischna-Ueberlieferung. Babylonische Mischna-Fragmente aus der Alt-Kairoer Geniza, veröffentlicht und kritisch untersucht. Diss. phil., Bonn 1927 (= *Jahrbuch XVIII der Jüdisch-literarischen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M. 1927)." Only fol. 35b, containing the end of Nidda (10³–8) and the beginning of Maškim, follows here; as the photos at the disposal of Friedmann were not legible, he was not able to publish this text.

- 35b לפקידה ואם יש לנו וסתו דיייה שעתינה ג רבי יהודה אומר כל
 שלא הפרישה בטירה ומן המנחה ולמענן הר"י זו בחוקת
 טומאה וחכמים אומרים אפילו שנים בנדתה בדקה ומוצתה טהור
 בין השמשות לא הפרישה לאחר ימים בדקה ומצתה טמא הרי
 זו בחוקת וטהרה ר' הוב והובה שבדקו עצמן ביום הראשון
 מצאו טהור וביום השביעי ומצאו טהור ושאר כל הימים לא
 בדקו רבי אליעזר אומר הרי אילו בחוקת טהרה רבי יהושע
 אומר אין להם אלא יום הראשון ויום השביעי בלבד רבי
 עקיבה אומר אין להם אלא יום שביעי ה' הוב והובה והנדה
 והילדות והמצורע שמינו מטמא במשא עד שימוק הבשר
 נוכרי שמת טהר מלטמא במשא בית שמי אומרים כל הנשים
 מיתות נידות ובית הלל אומרים אין נדה אלא שמיטה (נדה)
 ו האשה שמיטה ויצא ממנה רביעית דם מטמא משם כתם
 ומטמא (באהיל) רבי יהודה אומר אינו מטמא משם כתם לפי
 שניקק משמיטה רבי יהודה ואומר ביושבת על משבר ומיתה
 ויצא ממנה רביעית דם שהוא מטמא משם כתם ואמר רבי יוסה
 לפי כך אינו מטמא באהיל ו' בראשונה היו אומרים היושבת
- Nidda 10 3
4
5
6
7

^a מבט is added here and deleted.

ועל דם טוהר היתה מערה מים לפסח חזרו לומר הרי היא כמגע טמא מת לקדשים וכדבריו בית הלל בית שמי אומרים כטמא מת ומודים שהיא אוכלת במעשר וקוצה לה חלה ומקפת וקורא להם שם ואם נפל מירוקה ומדם טהרה על כיכר שלתרומה שהוא טהור שבית שמי אומרים צריכה טבילה באחרונה ובית הלל אומרים אינה צריכה טבילה באחרונה הן הראוה יום אחד עשר וטבילה לערב ושימשה בית שמי אומרים מטמין במשכב ובמושב וחיבים בקורבן ובית הלל פוטרים מן הקורבן טבילה ביום שלאחריו ושימשה את ביתה ואחר כך ראת בית שמי אומרים מטמין במשכב ובמושב ופוטרים מן הקורבן ובית הלל אומרים הרי זה גרגרן ומודים בראוה בתוך אחד עשר וטבילה לערב ושימשה שהן מטמין במשכב וחיבים בקורבן טבילה ביום שלאחריו ושימשה הרי זו תרבות רעה ומגען ובעילתן תלויים הנא פרקא ה הלכתא ה חסלת נדה פרקי עשרה

Nidda 10

8

Maškir

משקים פרקא קדמאה: כל משוקה שתחילתו ברצון אף על פי שאין סופו ברצון או שסופו ברצון אף על פי שאין תחילתו וברצון הרי זה בכי יתן משקים טמאים מטמין לרצון ושלא לרצון ב המרעיד את והאילן להשיר ממנו אוכלים או את הטומאה אינן בכי יתן להשיר ממנו ומשקים בית שמי ואומרים היוצאים ואת שבו בכי יתן ובית הלל אומרים היוצאים ובכי יתן ואת נשבו אינם בכי יתן מפני שהוא מיתכוין שיצאו מכולו ג המרעיד את והאילו ונפל על חבירו או סוכה ונפלה על חבירתה ותחתיהן זרעים או ירקות מחוברות [...] ביתן הולל

1 1

2

3

² Cf. Lev. 11.38.

אומרים אינן בכי יתן אמר רבי יהושע... תמא בעצמך אם
 יש משקה טמא בותרה... הן הנוער אגודה³ שלירק וירדו
 מצד והעליון...

Maškim 13

4

For the text of Maškim 1, 4 till the end of Maškim (fol. 36a-38a middle) see Friedmann, p. 18-26.

Zabim

- 38a זבים פרקא קדמאה: הרואה ראייה אחת שלזב בית שמי אומרים
 כשומר יום כנגד יום ובית הלל אומרים כבעל קרי ראה אחת
 ובשני הפסיק בשלישי ראה שתים או אחת מרובה כשתים בית
 שמי אומרים זב גמור ובית הלל אומרים מטמא במשכב ובמושב
 וצריך ביאת מים חיים ופטור מן הקרבן ב אמר רבי לעזר
 בן יהודה מודים בית שמי בזה שאינו זב גמור ועל מה נחלקו
 על הרואה שתים או אחת מרובה כשתים והפסיק בשלישי ראה
 אחת בית שמי אומרים זב גמור ובית הלל אומרים מטמא משכב
 ומושב וצריך ביאת מים חיים ופטור מן הקרבן ג הרואה קרי
 יום שלישי לספירת זובו בית שמי אומרים סותר שני ימים שלפניו
 ובית הלל אומרים לא סתר אילא יומו רבי ישמעאל אומר
 הרואה בשני סותר שלפניו רבי עקיבא אומר אחד ראה בשני
 ואחד ראה בשלישי בית שמי אומרים סותר שני ימים שלפניו
 ובית הלל אומרים לא סתר אילא יומו ברואה קרי אבל אם
 ראה זב אפילו יום שביעי סותר שלפניו ד ראה אחת היום
 ושתים למחר שתים היום ואחת למחר שלשה שלשלושה ימים
 או לשלשה לילות הרי זב גמור ה ראה אחת והפסיק כדי
 טבילה וספוג ואחד כך ראה שתים או אחת מרובה כשתים
 או שראה שתים או אחת מרובה כשתים והפסיק כדי טבילה
- 38b

³ MS: שילרק.

וְסִיפּוֹ וְאַחֲרֵי כֵךְ רָאָה אַחַת הָרִי זָב גָּמֹר וְ רָאָה אַחַת מְרֻבָּה
כְּשֹׁלוֹשׁ כְּמִגְדֵּי יוֹן לִישְׁלוֹחַ שֶׁהֵן כְּדֵי שְׁתֵּי טַבִּילוֹת וְכִשְׁתֵּי סִיפּוֹנִים
הָרִי זֶה זָב גָּמֹר וְ רָאָה אַחַת מְרֻבָּה כִּשְׁתֵּים מִטָּמֵא בְּמִשְׁכָּב
וּמוֹשָׁב וְצִדִּיק⁵ בִּיאָת מִים חַיִּים וּפִטוֹר מִן הַקּוֹרְבָן אֲמַר
רַבִּי יוֹסֵה לֹא אָמְרוּ אַחַת מְרֻבָּה אֵילָא אִם יֵשׁ בָּהּ כְּדֵי שְׁלוֹשׁ
חַ רָאָה אַחַת הַיּוֹם וְאַחַת בֵּין הַשְּׁמָשׁוֹת אַחַת בֵּין הַשְּׁמָשׁוֹת וְאַחַת
לְמַחֲרֵי אִם יָדוּעַ שְׁמִיקְצָת הָרֵאִיָּה מֵהַיּוֹם וּמִקְצָתָהּ לְמַחֲרֵי וּדְרָאִי
לְטוֹמְאָה וְלִקְוֹרְבָן וְאִם סָפֵק שְׁמִיקְצָת הָרֵאִיָּה מֵהַיּוֹם וּמִקְצָתָהּ
לְמַחֲרֵי וּדְרָאִי לְטוֹמְאָה וְסָפֵק לְקוֹרְבָן רָאָה שְׁנֵי יָמִים בֵּין הַשְּׁמָשׁוֹת
סָפֵק לְטוֹמְאָה וְלִקְוֹרְבָן אַחַת בֵּין הַשְּׁמָשׁוֹת סָפֵק לְטוֹמְאָה הֵנָּה
פֶּרֶק אֶתְמַר הֵלֵךְ חַ פֶּרֶק אֶת בִּי הַכֹּל מִיטָמֵא בְּזִיבָה אֶף
הַגִּירִים וְהַעֲבָדִים בֵּין מְשֻׁחָרְרִים בֵּין שְׁאֵינָן מְשֻׁחָרְרִים וְחֹרֵשׁ
וְשׁוֹטֵה וְקָטָן וְסָרִיס אֲדָם וְסָרִיס חֲמָה וְטוֹמְטוֹם וְאוֹנִדְרוֹגוֹנוֹס
וְנוֹתָנִים עֲלֵיהֶם חוֹמְרֵי הָאִישׁ וְחוֹמְרֵי הָאִשָּׁה וְמִטָּמְאִים בָּדָם כְּאִשָּׁה
וּבְלוֹבָן כְּאִישׁ וְטוֹמְאָתָן בְּסָפֵק בִּי בְּשִׁבְעָה דְרָכִים בּוֹדְקִים אֶת
הַזָּב עַד שֶׁלֹּא נִיזְקָק לְזִיבָה בְּמֵאֹכֶל וּבְמִשְׁתֵּהּ בְּמִשְׁאֵה בְּקִפְצָה
בְּחוֹלִי וּבְמִרְאָה וּבְהִירְהוּר הִירְהָר עַד שֶׁלֹּא רָאָה אוֹ רָאָה עַד
שֶׁלֹּא הִירְהָר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר אֶפִּילוֹ רָאָה בַּהֲמָה חִיָּה וְעוֹף
מִיתְעַסְסִים זֶה עִם זֶה וְאֶפִּילוֹ רָאָה בְּגִדֵי צְבוּעַ אִשָּׁה רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה
אוֹמֵר אֲכָל כָּל מֵאֹכֶל בֵּין רָע וּבֵין יָפֵה וְשׁוֹתָה כָּל מִשְׁקָה אָמְרוּ
לוֹ אִם כֵּן זָבִים מֵעֵתָה אֲמַר לָהֶם אֵין אַחֲרִיּוֹת זָבִים עֲלֵיכֶם מִי
שֶׁנִּיזְקָק לְזִיבָה אֵין בּוֹדְקִים אֹתוֹ אוֹנְסוֹ וְסָפִיקוּ וְשִׁכְּבָת זָרְעוּ טָמְאִים
שְׁנִיזְלִים לְדַבָּר גַּם רָאָה רֵאִיָּה רֵאשׁוֹנָה בּוֹדְקִים אֹתוֹ בְּשֵׁנִיָּה בּוֹדְקִים
אֹתוֹ בְּשִׁלִּישִׁית אֵין בּוֹדְקִים אֹתוֹ רַבִּי לְעוֹזֵר אוֹמֵר אֶף בְּשִׁלִּישִׁית

⁴ The MS. has here added above the line זָב.

⁵ מִי is added here and deleted.

בִּדְרָקִים אֹתוֹ מִפְּנֵי הַקּוֹרְבָן דַּ הָרוֹאֶה קָרִי אֵינוֹ מִיטְמֵא בְּזִיבָה
 מַעַתָּ לַעַת רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר יוֹמוֹ גּוֹי שֶׁרָאָה קָרִי וּמִתְנַיֵּיר מִיד
 מִיטְמֵא בְּזִיבָה הָרוֹאֶה דָם הִמְקֵשָׁה מַעַתָּ לַעַת וְהִמְכָּה אֶת עֶבְדּוֹ
 יוֹם אוֹ יוֹמִים מַעַתָּ לַעַת כָּלֵב שֶׁאֵכֵל בֶּשָׂר הֵמָּה שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים מַעַתָּ
 לַעַת וְהוּא כִּבְרִיתוֹ הֵ הֹזֵב מִטְמֵא אֶת הַמֶּשְׁכָּב בַּחֲמֹשֶׁה דְּרָכִים
 לְטֵמָא אֲדָם וּלְטֵמָא בְּגָדִים עוֹמֵד יוֹשֵׁב שׁוֹכֵב וְנִיתְלָה וְנִשְׁעָן וְהִמְשְׁכָּב
 אֶת הָאָדָם בִּשְׁבָע דְּרָכִים לְטֵמָא בְּגָדִים עוֹמֵד יוֹשֵׁב וְשׁוֹכֵב וְנִיתְלָה
 וְנִשְׁעָן בִּמְגוֹעַ וּבִמְשָׁא הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק אַ הִלְכְתָּהּ הֵ פֶּרֶק אַ הֹזֵב
 וְהִטְהוֹר שִׁישְׁבוּ בִּסְפִינָה אוֹ בְּאִיסְרָה אוֹ שֶׁרָכְבוּ עַל גְּבִי
 הַבְּהֵמָה אֶף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵין בְּגִדֵיהֶם נוֹגְעִים הִרִי אֵילוֹ טִמְאִים מִדְּרָס
 יֵשְׁבוּ עַל הַנֶּסֶךְ וְעַל הַסֶּפֶסֶל וְעַל הַגִּישִׁי שְׁלִמִיטָה עַל הָאֵכֵל וְנִסָּה
 בּוֹמֵן שֶׁהֵן מַחְגִּירִים עָלוּ בְּאֵילָן שֶׁכּוּחוֹ רָע וּבִסּוּכָה שֶׁכּוּחוֹ רָע
 וּבְאֵילָן יָפֵה וּבִסּוּלָם הַמְצָרִי בּוֹמֵן שֶׁאֵינוֹ קָבֹועַ בְּמַסְמֵר עַל הַכֶּבֶשׂ
 וְעַל הַקּוֹרָא וְעַל הַדֹּלֶת בּוֹמֵן שֶׁאֵינוֹ עֹשִׂים בְּטִיט טִמְאִים רַבִּי
 יְהוּדָה מֵטֵהֵר בִּי מְגִיפִים אוֹ פּוֹתָחִים וְחֹכְמִים אוֹמְרִים עַד שִׁיֵּהָ
 זֶה מִיָּגִיף וְזֶה פּוֹתַח מַעֲלִים זֶה אֶת זֶה מִן הַבּוֹר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה
 אוֹמֵר עַד שִׁיֵּהִי הִטְהוֹר מַעֲלָה אֶת הַטְּמֵא וּמַפְשִׁילִים בַּחֲבָלִים
 וְחֹכְמִים אוֹמְרִים עַד שִׁיֵּהִי זֶה מוֹשֵׁךְ הֵלֶךְ וְזֶה מוֹשֵׁךְ הֵלֶךְ וְאוֹרְגִים
 בֵּין בְּעוֹמְדִים בֵּין בְּיוֹשְׁבִים אוֹ טוֹחֲנִים רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן מֵטֵהֵר בְּכֹלֶם
 חוּץ מִן הַטּוֹחֲנִים בְּרִיחִים שְׁלִיד גַּ וְפוֹרְקִים מִן הַחֲמוֹר אוֹ טוֹעֲנִים
 בּוֹמֵן שְׁמִסּוֹאֵן כְּבִיד טִמְאִים וּבּוֹמֵן שְׁמִסּוֹאֵן קָל טַהוֹרִים וְכֹלֶם
 טַהוֹרִים לְבָנִי כְּנֶסֶת וְטִמְאִים לְתִרּוּמָה דַּ הֹזֵב וְהִטְהוֹר שִׁישְׁבוּ
 בִּסְפִינָה גְדוּלָה וְאִיוֹ הִיא סְפִינָה גְדוּלָה רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר כָּל

⁶ בו is written above the line.

⁷ On the margin: בְּשִׁידָה; above ס is written ש (בְּאִיסְרָה)

⁸ ה added above the line.

⁹ At first was written שְׁמִסּוֹאֵן, cf. 4.1.

שְׁאִינָה יְכוּלָהּ ¹⁰ לְהָסִיט בָּהּ אָדָם ה' יֵשְׁבוּ עַל הַנָּסֵר וְעַל הַסַּפֶּסֶל
 וְעַל הַנְּשִׁישׁ שְׁלֵמִיטָה עַל הָאֲכָלוֹנֶס בּוֹמָן שְׁאִינָן מַחְגִּירִים עָלָיו
 בְּאֵילָן שְׁכוּחוֹ יָפָה וּבִסּוּכָה שְׁכוּחָה יָפָה וּבִסּוּלֶם הַצּוּרִי אוֹ מִצְרֵי
 בּוֹמָן שֶׁהוּא קָבוע בְּמַסְמֶר' עַל הַכָּבֵשׁ וְעַל הַקּוּרָא וְעַל הַדָּלֶת
 בּוֹמָן שֶׁהֵן עֲשׂוּיִים בְּטִיט אֶפִּילוֹ מִיצֵד אֶחָד טְהוּרִים וְ הַטְּהוּר
 מִכָּה אֶת הַטָּמֵא טְהוּר' וְטָמֵא מִכָּה אֶת הַטְּהוּר טָמֵא שֶׁאֵם מִשָּׁךְ
 הַטְּהוּר הַטָּמֵא נוֹפֵל הֵנָּה פֶּרְקָא ג' הִלְכְתָּא ו' פֶּרְקָא ד' רַבִּי
 יְהוֹשֻעַ אוֹמֵר נִידָה שִׁשְׁבָּה עִים הַטְּהוּרָה בְּמִיטָה כִפָּה שְׁבִרָאשָׁה
 טָמֵא מִדְרָס' יֵשְׁבָה בִּסְפִינָה כִלִּים שְׁבִרָאשׁ הֵנֶס שְׁבִסְפִינָה טָמֵאִים
 מִדְרָס וְנוֹטְלָת עֲרִיבָה מְלִיאָה בְּגָדִים בּוֹמָן שְׁמִסּוּאָן כְּבִיד טָמֵאִים
 וּבּוֹמָן שְׁמִסּוּאָן קָל טְהוּרִים זֶה שֶׁהִיקִישׁ עַל כְּסוּסְטָרָה וְנָפֵל
 כִּיכָר שֶׁלְתִרּוּמָה טְהוּר ב' הִמְיָקִישׁ עַל הַמְרִישׁ עַל הַמְלָבִין עַל
 הַצִּינוּר עַל הַדָּף אָף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא עֲשׂוּי בַחֲבָלִים עַל הַתָּנוּר
 וְעַל הַיָּם וְעַל הָאֶסְטֵרְבּוּל וְעַל חֲמֹר שְׁלִרְיָחִים וְשִׁלִּיד וְעַל סֵאָה
 שְׁלִרְיָחִים שְׁלִזִיתִים רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר אָף עַל הַקּוּרוֹת הַבִּלְאָנִים
 טְהוּר ג' הִיקִישׁ עַל הַדָּלֶת עַל הַנֶּגֶד עַל הַמְנַעוּל וְעַל הַמְשׁוּט
 וְעַל הַקָּלֶת וְעַל אֵילָן שְׁכוּחוֹ רַע וְעַל סוּכָה שְׁכוּחָה רַע וּבְאֵילָן
 יָפָה וּבִסּוּלֶם הַמְצִרִי בּוֹמָן ¹¹ שֶׁהוּא קָבוע בְּמַסְמֶר' עַל הַכָּבֵשׁ
 עַל הַקּוּרָא וְעַל הַדָּלֶת בּוֹמָן שְׁאִינָן עֲשׂוּיִים בְּטִיט טָמֵאִים עַל
 הַשִּׁידָה וְעַל הַתִּיבָה וְעַל הַמַּגְדָּל טָמֵאִים רַבִּי נְחוּמִיָּה וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן
 מְטָהֲרִים בְּאֵילוֹ ד' זֶה שֶׁהִיָּה מוֹטֵל עַל חֲמִשָּׁה סַפְסָלִים אוֹ עַל
 חֲמֵשׁ פּוֹנְדָאִיוֹת לְאוּרְכָן טָמֵאִים וּלְרוּחָבֵן טְהוּרִים יֵשֶׁן סַפִּיק
 נִיתְהַפֵּךְ עֲלֵיהֶם טָמֵאִים הִיָּה מוֹטֵל עַל שֵׁשׁ כְּסֵאוֹת שְׁתֵּי יָדָיו
 עַל שְׁנַיִם וְשְׁתֵּי רַגְלָיו עַל שְׁנַיִם וּרְאִשׁוֹ עַל אֶחָד וְגוֹפּוֹ עַל אֶחָד

¹⁰ On the margin: לְהָסִיט.

¹¹ In Vulg. and L: שְׁאִינָן.

Zabim 4 4

5

6

7

8

39b

5 1

אֵין טָמֵא אֵילָא זֶה שֶׁתַּחַת גּוֹפוֹ עוֹמֵד עַל שְׁנֵי כַסְאִיּוֹת רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן
 אוֹמֵר אִם רַחֲוִקִים זֶה מִזֶּה טְהוֹרִים הִ' עֲשֶׂר טְלָאִיּוֹת זֹו עַל גְּבִי
 זֹו יֵשֵׁב עַל גְּבִי הָעֲלִיוֹנָה כּוֹלֵם טְמִיאוֹת הָזֵב בְּכָף מְאֻזִּים וְהַמְשַׁכֵּב
 וְהַמּוֹשֵׁב מִכְנָדוֹ כִּרְעִי¹² הָזֵב טְהוֹרִים כִּרְעוּ הֵם טְמִיאִים רַבִּי
 שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר בִּיחִידִי טָמֵא וּבִמְרוֹבִים טְהוֹר שְׁאִין אַחֵר נוֹשֵׂא אֶת
 רֹובוֹ וְ הָזֵב בְּכָף מְאֻזִּים וְהַאֲכִילִים וְהַמְשָׁקִים בְּכָף שְׁנִיָּה טְמִיאִים
 וּבִמֶּת הַכֹּל טְהוֹר חוּץ מִן הָאָדָם זֶה חוֹמֵר בֹּזֵב מִיִּבְמַת וְחוֹמֵר
 שֶׁהוּא בֹזֵב מִיִּבְמַת שֶׁהָזֵב עוֹשֶׂה מְשַׁכֵּב וּמוֹשֵׁב מִתַּחְתּוֹ לְטָמֵא
 אָדָם וּלְטָמֵא בְּגָדִים וְעַל גְּבִי מִדֶּף וּלְטָמֵא אוֹכְלִים מֵה שְׁאִין
 הֵמָּה מְטָמֵא וְ חוֹמֵר בִּמֶּת שֶׁהֵמָּה מְטָמֵא בְּאֵהֶל וּמְטָמֵא טוֹמֵאֶת
 שִׁבְעָה מֵה שְׁאִין הָזֵב מְטָמֵא הִ' הִיָּה יוֹשֵׁב עַל גְּבִי הַמִּיטָה וְאֶרְבַּע
 טְלָאִיּוֹת תַּחַת אֶרְבַּע רִגְלֵי הַמִּיטָה טְמִיאוֹת מִפְּנֵי שְׁאִינָה יִכּוֹלָה
 לַעֲמֹד עַל שְׁלֹשׁ וּרְבִי שִׁמְעוֹן מִטְהַר הִיָּה רִכּוּב עַל¹³ גְּבִי בַּהֲמָה
 וְאֶרְבַּע טְלָאִיּוֹת תַּחַת רִגְלֵי בַּהֲמָה טְהוֹרוֹת מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהִיא יִכּוֹלָה
 לַעֲמֹד עַל שְׁלֹשׁ הִיתָה טְלִית אַחַת תַּחַת שְׁתֵּי יָדַיִם וְתַחַת שְׁתֵּי
 רִגְלָיִם תַּחַת יָד וְתַחַת רֵגֶל טְמֵאָה רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר הַסּוֹס בְּרִגְלָיו
 וְהַחֲמֹר בְּיָדָיו שֶׁמִּשְׁעָנָת הַסּוֹס עַל רִגְלָיו וּמִשְׁעָנָת הַחֲמֹר עַל
 יָדָיו¹⁴ יֵשֵׁב עַל קוֹרוֹת בֵּית הַבַּד שֶׁבְּעוֹקֶל טְמִיאִים וְעַל הַמְּכַבֵּשׁ
 שֶׁלְּכוֹבֵם כִּלִּים שֶׁתַּחְתּוֹ טְהוֹרִים וּרְבִי נַחוּמִיָּה מְטָמֵא הֵנָּה פֶּרְקָא דִּ
 הַלַּכְתָּא הִ' פֶּרְקָא הִ' הַנּוֹגֵעַ בֹּזֵב אוֹ שֶׁהָזֵב נוֹגֵעַ בּוֹ הַמִּיִּסֵּיט אֶת
 הָזֵב אוֹ שֶׁהָזֵב מְסִיטוֹ מְטָמֵא אוֹכְלִים וּמְשָׁקִים וְכִלֵּי שֹׁטֶף בְּמוֹעַ
 אֲבֵל לֹא בִּמְשָׁא כֹלל אֲמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ כֹּל הַמְטָמֵא בְּגָדִים בְּשַׁעַת
 מְגָעוֹ¹⁵ וּמְטָמֵא אוֹכְלִים וּמְשָׁקִים לִהְיוֹת תַּחְלָה וְהַיָּדִים לִהְיוֹת
 שְׁנִיּוֹת וְאִינוּ מְטָמֵא לֹא אָדָם וְלֹא כֹלִי חֶרֶס לְאַחַר פְּרִישְׁתּוֹ

¹² above the line.¹⁴ MS.: יוֹשֵׁב.¹³ The *patah* effaced.¹⁵ MS.: מְגָעוֹ.

מִטְמֵאִי¹⁶ מִטְמֵא מִשְׁקִים לִהְיוֹת תַּחֲלֶה וְהָאוֹכְלִים וְהַיָּדִים לִהְיוֹת
 שְׁנִיּוֹת וְאִינוּ מִטְמֵא בְּגָדִים בִּי עוֹד כֹּלֵל אַחֵר אֲמָרוּ כֹּל¹⁷ הַנִּשְׂאֵא
 עַל גְּבִי הָזֶב טָמֵא וְכֹל שֶׁחֹבֵב נִשְׂאֵא עָלָיו טָהוֹר חוּץ מִן הָרָאוּי
 לְמִשְׁכָּב וְלְמוֹשָׁב לְאָדָם כֹּאִיזָה צָד אֲצַבְעוֹ שְׁלוֹב תַּחַת הַנִּירְבֶּךְ
 הַטָּהוֹר מִלְמַעְלָן מִטְמֵא שְׁנַיִם וּפּוֹסֵל אַחֵר פָּרֵשׁ מִטְמֵא אַחֵר
 וּפּוֹסֵל אַחֵר גַּם הַטָּמֵא מִלְמַעְלָן וְהַטָּהוֹר מִלְמַטָּן מִטְמֵא שְׁנַיִם
 וּפּוֹסֵל אַחֵר¹⁸ פָּרֵשׁ מִטְמֵא אַחֵר וּפּוֹסֵל אַחֵר הָאוֹכְלִים וְהַמִּשְׁקִים
 וְהַמִּשְׁכָּב וְהַמּוֹשָׁב וְהַמְדָּף מִלְמַעְלָן וּמִטְמֵאִים אַחֵר וּפּוֹסֵלִים אַחֵר
 פָּרִשׁוּ מִטְמֵאִים אַחֵר וּפּוֹסֵלִים אַחֵר הַמִּשְׁכָּב וְהַמּוֹשָׁב מִלְמַטָּן מִטְמֵאִים
 שְׁנַיִם וּפּוֹסֵלִים אַחֵר פָּרִשׁוּ מִטְמֵאִים אַחֵר וּפּוֹסֵלִים אַחֵר הָאוֹכְלִים
 וְהַמִּשְׁקִים וְהַמְדָּף מִלְמַטָּן טָהוֹרִים דִּ מִפְּנֵי שֶׁאֲמָרוּ כֹּל הַנוֹשֵׂא
 וְהַנִּשְׂאֵא עַל גְּבִי נְבִילָה טָהוֹר חוּץ מִן הָאָדָם וְכֹל הַנוֹשֵׂא וְהַנִּשְׂאֵא
 עַל גְּבִי מִשְׁכָּב טָהוֹר חוּץ מִן הַמִּסִּיט רַבִּי לַעֲזֹר אֹמֵר אֵף
 הַנוֹשֵׂא וְכֹל הַנוֹשֵׂא וְהַנִּשְׂאֵא עַל גְּבִי הֵמָּה טָהוֹר חוּץ מִן הַמֵּאֲהִיל
 וְאָדָם בּוֹמֵן שֶׁהוּא מִסִּיט הֵּ מִקְצַת טָמֵא עַל הַטָּהוֹר וּמִקְצַת
 טָהוֹר עַל הַטָּמֵא חִיבוּרוֹ טָמֵא עַל הַטָּהוֹר וְחִיבוּרוֹ טָהוֹר עַל
 הַטָּמֵא טָמֵא רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אֹמֵר מִקְצַת טָמֵא עַל הַטָּהוֹר טָמֵא
 וּמִקְצַת טָהוֹר עַל הַטָּמֵא טָהוֹר וְהַטָּמֵא עַל מִקְצַת מִשְׁכָּב וְהַטָּהוֹר
 עַל מִקְצַת מִשְׁכָּב טָמֵא מִקְצַת טָמֵא עַל הַמִּשְׁכָּב וּמִקְצַת טָהוֹר
 עַל הַמִּשְׁכָּב טָהוֹר נִימְצְאָת טוֹמְאָה נִכְנָסָת לוֹ וְיוֹצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ בְּמַעֲוָטוֹ
 וְכִיכָר שְׁלֹתְרוֹמָה שֶׁהִיא נְתוּנָה עַל גְּבִי הַמִּשְׁכָּב וְהַנִּיר בִּנְתָיִים
 בֵּין מִלְמַעְלָן וּבֵין מִלְמַטָּן טָהוֹר וְכֵן בָּאֲבוֹ מְנוּעֶת טָהֵר וְרַבִּי

¹⁶ The MS. adds here מימטמין without vowels.

¹⁷ MS.: הַנוֹשֵׂא.

¹⁸ Added on the margin.

שמעון מטמא בוו ז' הנוגע בזב ובזבה ובנידה ובילדת ובמצורע
 ובמשכב ובמושב מטמא שנים ופוסל אחד פרש מטמא¹⁹ אחד
 ופוסל אחד אחד הנוגע ואחד המסיט אחד הנושא ואחד הנישא
 ה הנוגע בזבו שלזב ברוקו ובשכבת זרעו ובמימי רגליו ובדס
 נידה מטמא שנים ופוסל אחד פרש מטמא אחד ופוסל אחד
 אחד הנוגע ואחד המסיט רבי לעזר אומר אף הנושא ט הנושא
 את המרכב והנישא עליו והמסיטו מטמא שנים ופוסל אחד
 הנושא את הנבלה ומי חטאת שיש בהם כדי הואייה מטמא
 שנים ופוסל אחד פרש מטמא אחד ופוסל אחד האוכל מנבלת
 העוף הטהור והיא בבית הבליעה מטמא שנים ופוסל אחד
 פרש מטמא שנים ופוסל אחד היכנים ראשו לאויר תנור טהור
 וטהור התנור היקיאה או בלעה מטמא אחד ופוסל אחד
 וכשהוא בתוך פיו עד שלא יבלענה טהור ז' הנוגע בשדך ובשכבת
 זרע ובטמא מת ובמצורע בימי ספרו²⁰ ובמי חטאות שאין בהם
 כדי הואי' בנבילה ובמרכב מטמא אחד ופוסל אחד זה הכלל
 כל הנוגע באחד מכל אבות הטמאות שבטורה מטמא אחד
 ופוסל אחד חוץ מן האדם פרש מטמא אחד ופוסל אחד יא בעל
 קרי כמגע שדך ובעל נדה כטמא מת אילא שחמור ממנו בועל
 נדה שהוא מטמא במשכב ובמושב בטומאה קלה לטמא אוכלים
 ומשקים יב אילו פוסלים את התרומה האוכל אוכל ראשון
 והאוכל אוכל שני והשותה משקים טמאים הבא ראשו ורובו
 במים שאובים והטהור שנפלו על ראשו ועל רובו שלשת לוגים
 מים שאובים והספר והידים וטבול יום והאוכלים והכילים
 שניטמאו במשקים הנא פרקא ה הלכתא יב חסלת זבים פרקי חמשה

¹⁹ אחד added above the line.

²⁰ In the MS.: ובימי.

טבול יום פרקא קדמאה: ²¹הַמְכָּנִים חָלוֹת עַל מִנֵּת לַהֲפָרִישׁ 1 1
 וּנְשָׁכָן בֵּית שְׁמִי אֹמְרִים חִיבּוּר בְּטָבוֹל יוֹם וּבֵית הַלֵּל אֹמְרִים
 אֵין חִיבּוּר נִקְרָצוֹת וּנְשָׁכוֹת זֶה בְּזוֹ וְכִיכְרִים נוֹשְׁכִים זֶה בָּזֶה
 הָאוֹפֶה חֲמִיטָא עַל גְּבִי חֲמִיטָא עַד שְׁלֹא קִרְמוּ בַתְּנוּר וְקוּלִית
 שְׁלָמִים הַמְּחֻלְחֵלֶת וְרִתּוּחַת גְּרִיסִים שְׁלֹפּוֹל רֵאשׁוֹנָה וְרִתּוּחַת יֵין
 חֲדָשׁ רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר וְאַף שְׁלֹאֲרוֹ בֵּית שְׁמִי אֹמְרִים חִיבּוּר
 וּבֵית הַלֵּל אֹמְרִים אֵינָן חִיבּוּר וּמוֹדִים בְּשֹׂאֵר כָּל הַטְּמְאוֹת בֵּין
 קָלוֹת בֵּין חֲמוּרוֹת בִּי הַמְכָּנִים חָלוֹת עַל מִנֵּת שְׁלֹא לַהֲפָרִישׁ 2
 וְהָאוֹפֶה עַל גְּבִי חֲמִיטָה מִי שֶׁקִּרְמוּ בַתְּנוּר וְקוּלִית שְׁלָמִים שְׁאִינָה
 מְחֻלְחֵלֶת וְרִתּוּחַת גְּרִיסִים שְׁלֹפּוֹל שְׁנִיָּה וְרִתּוּחַת יֵין יֶשֶׁן וְשִׁלְשֹׁמֶן
 לְעוֹלָם וְשִׁלְעֵדָשִׁים רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר וְאַף שְׁלֹפּוֹחַ טְמָאִים בְּטָבוֹל
 יוֹם וְאֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ לֵאמֹר בְּכָל הַטְּמְאוֹת גִּי ²²מִסְמֵךְ שֶׁאַחֲרֵי הַכִּיכָר 3
 וְגִרְגֵר מֶלֶח קֶטָן ²³וְהַחֲרָחוּר פָּחוֹת מִכְּאֻצְבַּע רַבִּי יוֹסֶה אֹמֵר
 כָּל שֶׁהוּא נֹאכָל עִמּוֹ טְמָאִים בְּטָבוֹל יוֹם וְאֵין צוֹרֵךְ לֵאמֹר בְּכָל
 הַטְּמְאוֹת דִּ צְרוּר שֶׁבְּכִיכָר וְגִרְגֵר מֶלֶח גְּדוֹל הַתּוֹרְמוֹס וְהַחֲרָחוּר 4
 יִתֵּר מִכְּאֻצְבַּע רַבִּי יוֹסֶה אֹמֵר כָּל שֶׁאֵינוֹ נֹאכָל עִמּוֹ טְהוּרִים
 בְּאֵב הַטּוֹמְאָה וְאֵין צוֹרֵךְ לֹמֵר בְּטָבוֹל יוֹם הִי הַסְּעוּרָה וְהַכּוֹסְמֶת 5
 בּוֹמֵן שְׁאִינָן קְלוּפִים הִתִּיֵּא וְהַחִילִיתִּי וְהָאֵילוֹם רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר
 אֵף אֶפּוֹנִים שְׁחוּרִים טְהוּרִים בְּאֵב הַטּוֹמְאָה וְאֵין צוֹרֵךְ לֹמֵר
 בְּטָבוֹל יוֹם דְּבִרִי רַבִּי מֵאִיר וְחַכְמִים אֹמְרִים טְהוּרִים בְּטָבוֹל
 יוֹם וְטְמָאִים בְּכָל הַטְּמְאוֹת וְהַסְּעוּרָה וְהַכּוֹסְמֶת בּוֹמֵן שֶׁהֵן קְלוּפִים 6

²¹ In 12 written: הַמְכָּנִים.

²² Sic, "support", instead of מִסְמֵךְ, "nail".

²³ The word was not clearly written and is repeated on the margin.

Tebul Yōm

16

40b

והחיטא בין קלופה בין שאינה קלופה הקצצה והשמשם והפלפל
 רבי יהודה אומר ואף אפונים לבנים טמאים בטבול יום ואין
 צורך לומר בכל הטמאות הנא פרקא קדמאה הלכתא ו
 פרקא ב משקה טבול יום כמשקים שהוא נוגע בהם אילו ואילו
 אינן מטמאים ושאר כל הטמאים בין קלים בין המורים המשקים
 היוצאים מהם כמשקים שהוא נוגע בהם אילו ואילו תחלה
 חוץ מן המשקה שהוא אב לטומאה ובו קדירה שהוא מליאה
 משקים ונגע בה טבול יום אם היו משקה תרומה למשקים
 ופסולים והקדירה טהורה ואם היו משקה חולין הכל טהור
 ואם היו ידים סאובות הכל טמא זה חומר בידיים מיביטבול
 יום וחומר ביטבול יום²⁴ שספק טבול יום פוסל את התרומה
 והידיים ספיק טהור ג המיקפא שלתרומה והשום והשמץ שלחולין
 נגע טבול יום במקצתם פסל את כולם והמיקפא שלחולין
 והשום והשמץ שלתרומה נגע טבול יום במקצתם לא פסל אילא
 מקום מגען ואם היה השום מרובה הולכים אחר המרובה אמר
 רבי יהודה אימתי בזמן שהן גוש בקערה אבל אם היה מפוזר
 במדיכא טהור מפני שהוא רוצה בפיוזרו ושאר כל הנידוכין²⁵
 שראבן במשקים את שדרכו לדרך במשקים וראבן שלא במשקים
 והם גוש בקערה הרי אילו כעגול שלדבילה ד המיקפא והחמיטא
 שלחולין ושמץ שלתרומה צף על גביהם נגע טבול יום בשמץ
 לא פסל אילא השמץ ואם חיבץ מכל מקום שהילך השמץ פסל
 ה בשר הקדש שקדם עליו הקופה נגע טבול יום בקופה חתיכות
 מותרות נגע בחתיכה חתיכה וכל העולים עמה חיבור רבי
 יוחנן בן גורי אומר שניהם חיבור זה לזה וכן בקטניות שקרמו

²⁴ In the MS. written שספק and changed into שספק.

²⁵ MS. במדיכא sic!

עַל גְּבִי פְרוּסוֹת וְ מַעֲשֵׂה קִדְרָה וְקִטְנִיּוֹת בְּזִמָּן שֶׁהֵן פְּרוּרִים
 אֵינֶן חִיבֹר וּבְזִמָּן שֶׁהֵן לֹשׁ חִיבֹר וְאִם הֵיוּ לְוֹשִׁים הֲרֵבָה הָרִי
 אֵילוֹ יִמְנֹו וְהַשֹּׁמֵן שֶׁהוּא צָף עַל גְּבִי הֵיין נִגַּע טָבֹול יוֹם בִּשְׁמֹן
 לֹא פָסֵל אֵילֹא הַשֹּׁמֵן רַבֵּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי אוֹמֵר חִיבֹר זֶה לֹזֶה
 וְ חִבִּית שֶׁשֶּׁקְעָה לַחוּךְ הַבֹּר שְׁלִיין וְנִגַּע בָּהּ טָבֹול יוֹם מִן הַסֶּפֶה
 וּלְפָנִים חִיבֹר מִן הַסֶּפֶה וְלַחוּץ אֵינֶן חִיבֹר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי
 אוֹמֵר אֵפוֹלוֹ עַל גְּבִי רֹם קוֹמָה וְנִגַּע כִּגְדִּי פִיָּה חִיבֹר הֵ חִבִּית
 שְׁנִיקָבָה בֵּין מִשּׁוּלֵיָּהּ וּבֵין מִצִּידָּהּ נִגַּע טָבֹול יוֹם טְמִיאָה רַבִּי
 יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר מִפִּיָּהּ וּמִשּׁוּלֵיָּהּ טְמֵאָה וּמִן הַצִּדָּדִים מִיָּכָן וּמִיָּכָן
 טְהוּרָה הַמַּעֲרָה מְכָלִי לְכָלִי וְנִגַּע טָבֹול יוֹם בְּקִלוֹחַ אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ
 יַעֲלֶה בְּאֶחָד וּמֵאָה ט' בְּעֶבֶד שְׂבַחֲבִית שְׁנִיקָב בֵּין מִיבִיפְנוּס בֵּין
 מִיבְּחוּץ זֶה כִּגְדִּי זֶה טְמֵא בְּאֶב הַטּוֹמֵאָה וְטְמֵא בְּאֶהֱל הַמֶּת
 הַפְּנִימִי מִלְמַטָּו וְהַחִיצוֹן מִלְמַעֲלָן טְמֵא בְּאֶב הַטּוֹמֵאָה וְטְמֵא
 בְּאֶהֱל הַמֶּת הַפְּנִימִי מִלְמַעֲלָן וְהַחִיצוֹן מִלְמַטָּן טְהוּר בְּאֶב הַטּוֹמֵאָה
 וְטְמֵא בְּאֶהֱל הַמֶּת הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק א' ב' הַלַּכְתָּ ט' פֶּרֶק א' ג' כָּל יְדוֹת
 הַכִּילִים שֶׁהֵן חִיבֹר בְּאֶב הַטּוֹמֵאָה חִיבֹר בְּטָבֹול יוֹם אוֹכֵל
 שְׁנִיפֶרֶס וּמַעֲרָה מִקְצֵת רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר אִם אוֹחוֹ בְּגָדוֹל וְהַקָּטָן
 עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ הָרִי הוּא כְמוֹהוּ רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר אִם אוֹחוֹ בְּקָטָן
 וְהַגָּדוֹל עוֹלָה עִמּוֹ הָרִי הוּא כְמוֹהוּ רַבִּי נַחֲמִיָּה אוֹמֵר בְּטְהוּר
 וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים בְּטְמֵא וְשֹׂאֵר כָּל הָאוֹכְלִים אֶת שְׁדֵרְכָן לֹאחוֹ
 בְּעֵלָה אוֹחוֹזִים אוֹתוֹתוֹ בְּעֵלָה בְּקָלָה אוֹחוֹזִים אֹתוֹ בְּקָלָה ב' יֶרֶק
 שְׁלֹתְרוֹמָה וּבִיצָה טְרֹפָה נִתּוֹנָה עַל גְּבִי נִגַּע טָבֹול יוֹם בְּבִיצָה
 לֹא פָסֵל אֵילֹא הַקָּלָה שֶׁכִּנְגְּרוּ רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר כָּל הַסּוֹדֵר הָעֲלִיין
 אִם הֵיָתָה כְּמוֹן כּוֹבֵעַ אֵינָה חִיבֹר ג' חוּט שְׁלִבִּיצָה שֶׁקָּרַם עַל

²⁶ In the MS.: בְּעֵלָה, sic!

Tebul Yom

3 3

3 4

5

4 1

41a

דיפנה שלאלפס ונגע בו טבול יום מן הספה ולפנים חיבור
 ומן הספה ולחוץ אינו חיבור רבי יוסה אומר חוט וכל שניקלף
 עמו וכן בקטניות שקרמו על שפתה שלקדירה ה' עיסה שנידמעה
 או שניתחמצה [בשאור] שלתרומה אינה נפסלת בטבול יום רבי
 יוסה ורבי שמעון פוסלים עיסה שהוכשרה [במשקה] ונילושה
 במי פירות ונגע בה טבול יום רבי לעזר בן יהודה איש ברתותא
 אומר משם רבי יהושע פסל את ²⁷פסל את ²⁸כולו רבי עקיבה אומר
 משמו לא פסל אלא מקום מגעו ירק שלחולין שבשלן בשמן
 שלתרומה ונגע בו טבול יום רבי לעזר בן יהודה איש ברתותא
 אומר משם רבי יהושע פסל את כולו ורבי עקיבה אומר משמו
 לא פסל אלא מקום מגעו ה' הטחור ²⁹שנגע מן האוכל ונפל
 על בגדיו ועל כיכר שלתרומה טהור היה אוכל זיתים פצועים
 ותמרים רטובות כל שהוא רוצה למוץ את גלענתו נפל על
 בגדיו ועל כיכר שלתרומה טמא היה אוכל זיתים נגובים ותמרים
 יבישים כל שאינו רוצה למוץ את גלענתו ונפל על בגדיו ועל
 כיכר שלתרומה טהור אחד טהור ואחד טבול יום באילו רבי
 מאיר ³⁰אומר אילו ואילו טמאים בטבול יום שמשקיו שלטמא
 מכשירים לרצונו ושלוא לרצונו וחכמים אומרים אין טבול יום
 טמא הנא פרקא ג' הלכתא ה' פרקא ד' אוכל מעשר שהוכשר
 במשקה ונגע בו טבול יום או ידים מסואבות מפרישים ממנו
 תרומת המעשר בטהרה מפני שהוא שלישי והשלישי טהור לחולים

²⁷ MS.: פוסל.

²⁸ It was written כולו and changed into כולו, and so it is repeated on the margin.

²⁹ So even on the margin; originally שנגס was written in the text.

³⁰ Added on the margin.

בִּהְיוֹתָהּ שֶׁהָיָה טְבוּלָתָּ יוֹם לִשְׁלֹשָׁה אֲתָּה הָעֵיסָה וּקְוָצָה לָהּ חֻלָּה
 וּמִפְּרָשְׁתָּהּ וּמִנְחָתָהּ בְּכַפִּישָׁה אוֹ בְּנִחוּתָא וּמִקָּפְתָּ וּקוֹרָא לָהּ שֵׁם
 מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהָיָה שְׁלִישִׁי וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁי טָהוֹר לְחֻלּוּן גִּ' עֲרִיבָה שֶׁהָיָה טְבוּלָתָּ
 יוֹם לְשֵׁם בָּהּ אֲתָּה הָעֵיסָה וּקְוָצִים מִמֶּנָּה חֻלָּה וּמִקָּפְתָּ וּקוֹרָא
 לָהּ שֵׁם מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהָיָה שְׁלִישִׁי וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁי טָהוֹר לְחֻלּוּן ד' לִגְנִין שֶׁהוּא
 טְבוּל יוֹם וּמִלֵּהוּ מִן הַחֲבִית מַעֲשֶׂר טַבֵּל אִם אֲמַר הָרִי זֶה תְּרוּמַת
 הַמַּעֲשֶׂר מִשְׁתַּחֲשֵׁךְ הָרִי זֶה תְּרוּמַת הַמַּעֲשֶׂר וְאִם אֲמַר הָרִי זֶה
 עִירֹב לֹא אֲמַר כִּלּוֹם נִשְׁבְּרָה הַחֲבִית הַלֵּגִין בְּטִיבְלוֹ נִשְׁבְּרָה הַלֵּגִין
 וְהַחֲבִית בְּטִיבְלָהּ הִיא בְּרֹאשׁוֹנָה הִיא אוֹמְרִים מִחֻלָּלִים עַל פִּירוֹת
 עִם הָאָרֶץ חֲזָרוּ לֹמַר אֵף עַל מַעוֹתָיו בְּרֹאשׁוֹנָה הִיא אוֹמְרִים
 הַיּוֹצֵא בְּקוֹלָהּ וְאֲמַר כָּתְבוּ גִט לְאִשְׁתִּי הָרִי אֵילֹו יִכְתְּבוּ וְיִתְּנוּ
 חֹרֶךְ לֹמַר וְאֵף הַמַּפְרִישׁ וְהַיּוֹצֵא בְּשִׁיאָרָא וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן שׁוֹרִי
 אוֹמֵר וְאֵף הַמְּסוֹכֵן וְהַכְּדוּמִים וְהַאֲשְׁקֻלּוֹנִים שֶׁנִּשְׁבְּרוּ וְאִנְקִלִי
 שְׁלֹהֶם מִיָּמָת הָרִי אֵילֹו טַמְאִים הַמַּעֲדָר וְהַמְּזֹרָה וְהַמְּגֹוֵב וְכֵן
 מִסְרָק שְׁלֹרֵאשׁ שֶׁנִּיטְלָה אַחַת מִשִּׁנֵּיהֶם וְעָשָׂן שֶׁלֹּמְתַכָּת הָרִי אֵילֹו
 טַמְאִים וְעַל כּוֹלֵם אֲמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ דָּבָר חֲדָשׁ חִידָשׁוֹ סוֹפְרִים
 וְאֵין לִי מָה אֲשִׁיב זֶה הַתּוֹרֵם אֲתָּה הַבּוֹר וְאֲמַר הָרִי זֶה תְּרוּמָה עַל
 מִנֵּה שֶׁתַּעֲלֶה שְׁלוֹם שְׁלוֹם מִן הַשֶּׁבֶר וּמִן הַשְּׁפִיכָה אֲבָל לֹא מִן
 הַטּוֹמְאָה רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר אֵף מִן הַטּוֹמְאָה נִשְׁבְּרָה וְאֵינָהּ
 מִדְּמַעַת עַד ³²אֵיכֵן תִּשְׁבֵּר וְלֹא ³³תִּידְמַע עַד כִּדִּי שֶׁתִּתְּנֶלְגַל
 וְתִנָּע לְבוֹר רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר אֵף מִי שֶׁהָיָה בּוֹ דַּעַת לְהַתְנוּת וְלֹא
 הִיתְנָה נִשְׁבְּרָה וְאֵינָהּ מִדְּמַעַת מִפְּנֵי ³⁴שֶׁהוּא תִנָּי בֵּית דִּין הֵנָּה
 פִּרְקָא דִּי הִלְכְתָּא זֶה חֲסֵלַת טְבוּל יוֹם פִּרְקִי דִּי: יָדִים פִּרְקָא

³¹ Added on the margin.

³² Was written **אֵינן**, changed into **אֵיכֵן**, and this is repeated on the margin.

³³ Sic! According to the consonants we would expect **תִּידְמַע**.

³⁴ Here is written **שִׁנָּה**.

קדמא מ' רביעית נותנים לידים לאחד אף לשנים מחצי לוג 1 1
 ולשלשה לארבעה מילוג לחמשה ולעשרה ולמאה רבי יוסה
 אומר ובלבד שלא יפחות לאחרון שבהם מרביעית מוסיפים
 על השניים ואין מוסיפים על הראשונים ב' בכל הכילים נותנים 2
 לידים [ואפילו] בכלי גללים ובכלי אבנים ובכלי אדמה נותנים
 לידים ואין נותנים לידים לא בדיפנות הכילים [ולא] בשוללי
 המחץ ולא במגופת החבית ולא יתן לחבירו בחופניו מפני שאין
 ממלים ואין מקדשים [ואין] מוים מ' חטאת ואין נותנים לידים
 אילא בכלי ואין מצילים צמיד פתיל אילא בכלים [ושאין] מציל 3
 מיד כלי חרס אילא כילים ג' המים שניפסלו משתית בהמה
 בכילים פסולים [ובקרקעות כשרים נפל לתוכו דיו קומום 41b
 וקלקנתום או שנישתנו מראיהם פסולים עשה בהם מלאכה ואו
 ששרא בהם פיתו פסולים שמעון החימני אומר אפילו ניתכו
 לישרות בזה ונפל לשני כשירים ד' הידיח בהם את הכילים 4
 או שמיחא בהם את המידות פסולים הידיח בהם כילים מודחים
 וחדשים כשירים ורבי יוסה פוסל בחדשים ה' המים שהנחתום 5
 מטביל בהם את ³⁵הגלוסקים פסולים וכשהוא מדיח ידיו כשרים
 הכל כשרים ליתין לידים אפילו חרש שוטף וקטן מניח חבית
 בין ³⁶בירכין ונוטל מטה חבית על צידה ונוטל ³⁷הקוף נותן
 לידים ורבי יוסה פוסל בשני אילו הנא פרקא קדמא הלכתא ה'
 פרקא ב' נוטל ידו אחת משטיפה אחת ידו טהורה שתי ידיו 2 1
 משטיפה אחת רבי מאיר מטמא עד שיטול מ' רביעית ונפל

³⁵ On the margin in Arabic: אלשואנב.

³⁶ * above the line.

³⁷ On the margin in Arabic: אלקירר, i. e. "the monkey."

כיכר שלתרומה טהור ורבי יוסה מטמא ב נטל את הראשונים
 למקום אחד ואת השניים למקום אחד ונפל כיכר שלתרומה
 על הראשונים טמא ועל השניים טהור³⁸ נטל את הראשונים
 ואת השניים למקום אחד ונפל כיכר שלתרומה טמא נטל את
 הראשונים ונמצא על ידיו קיסם או צרור ידיו טמאות שאין
 המים האחרונים מטהרים אלא המים שעל גבי היד רבן שמעון
 בן גמליאל אומר כל שהוא מיבויית המים טהור ג הידים
 מיטמות ומטהרות עד הפרק כאיזה צד נטל את הראשונים עד
 הפרק ואת השניים חוץ לפרק חזרו ליד טהורה נטל את הראשונים
 ואת השניים חוץ לפרק חזרו ליד טמאה נטל את הראשונים
 בידו אחת ונמלך נטל את השניים בשתי ידיו טמאות נטל
 את הראשונים בשתי ידיו ונמלך ונטל את השניים בידו אחת
 ידיו טהורות נטל ידו אחת³⁹ ופשפשה בחברתה טמאה בראשו
 או בכותל טהורה נוטלים ארבעה חמשה זה בצד זה או זה על
 גבי זה ובלבד שיירפו שיבאו בהן מים ד ספק נעשה בהם
 מלאכה וספק לא נעשה בהם מלאכה ספק יש בהם כשיעור
 וספק שאין⁴⁰ בהם ספק טמאים ספק טהורים ספיקן טהור
 מפני שאמרו ספק ידים ליטמא טמא וליטהר טהור רבי יוסה
 אומר וליטהר טמא ה כאיזה צד היו ידיו⁴¹ טהורות ולפניו
 שני כיכרים טמאים ספק נגע וספק לא נגע היו ידיו טמאות
 ולפניו שני כיכרים טהורים ספק נגע וספק לא נגע היו ידיו

³⁸ By error נפל was written here. The dots above show that it was a mistake.

³⁹ On the margin: ושיפשפה.

⁴⁰ Inserted above the line.

⁴¹ MS.: ידיו.

אֶחָת טַמְאָה וְאֶחָת טְהוֹרָה וּלְפָנָיו שְׁנֵי כִכָּרִים טְהוֹרִים נֶגַע
בְּאֶחָת מֵהֶם סָפֵק בְּטַמְאָה נֶגַע וּסְפֵק בְּטְהוֹרָה נֶגַע הָיוּ יָדָיו טְהוֹרוֹת
וּלְפָנָיו שְׁנֵי כִכָּרִים אֶחָד טָמֵא וְאֶחָד טְהוֹר נֶגַע בְּאֶחָד מֵהֶם
סָפֵק בְּטַמְאָה נֶגַע וּסְפֵק בְּטְהוֹרָה נֶגַע הָיוּ יָדָיו אֶחָת טַמְאָה וְאֶחָת
טְהוֹרָה וּלְפָנָיו שְׁנֵי כִכָּרִים אֶחָד טָמֵא וְאֶחָד טְהוֹר נֶגַע בְּשֵׁתֵיהֶם
סָפֵק טַמְאָה בְּטַמְאָה וְטְהוֹרָה בְּטְהוֹרָה טַמְאָה בְּטְהוֹרָה וְטְהוֹרָה
בְּטַמְאָה הַיָּדִים כְּמוֹת שֶׁהָיוּ וְהַכִּכָּרִים כְּמוֹת שֶׁהָיוּ הֵנָּה פֶּרֶק א' ב'
הַלְכָתָא ה' פֶּרֶק א' ג' הַמְכַנִּים יָדָיו לְבֵית הַמְנוּנָעַ יָדָיו תַּחֲלָה 3 1
דְּבַרִּי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים יָדָיו שְׁנִיּוֹת כָּל הַמְטָמֵא
בְּגָדִים בְּשַׁעַת מַנְעוֹ מִטָּמֵא אוֹכְלִים וּמַשְׁקִים לֵהוֹיֹת תַּחֲלָה דְּבַרִּי
רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים לֵהוֹיֹת שְׁנִיּוֹת אִמְרוּ לוֹ לְרַבִּי
עֲקִיבָה הֵיכָן מֵאֲצִינוּ שֶׁהַיָּדִים תַּחֲלָה וּבְכָל מָקוֹם אָמַר לָהֶם
וְכִי הֵיכָן אִפְשָׁר לָהֶם לֵהוֹיֹת תַּחֲלָה אֵילָא אִם כֵּן נִיטְמָא גּוֹפּוֹ
חוּץ מִזֶּה הָאוֹכְלִים וְהַכִּילִים שְׁנִיטְמָאוּ בְּמַשְׁקִים מִטַּמְאִים אֵת
הַיָּדִים לֵהוֹיֹת שְׁנִיּוֹת דְּבַרִּי רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים אֵת 42a
שְׁנִיטְמָא בְּאֵב הַטּוֹמְאָה מִטָּמֵא אֵת הַיָּדִים וְאֵת שְׁנִיטְמָא בּוֹלֵד
הַטּוֹמְאָה אֵינוֹ מִטָּמֵא אֵת הַיָּדִים ב' אָמַר רַבִּן גַּמְלִיאֵל מַעֲשֵׂה 2
בְּאִשָּׁה שֶׁבָּאתָ לְפָנַי אֲבָא וְאָמַרָה לוֹ נִכְנְסוּ יָדֶי לְאוֹרֹר כְּלִי חֲרָשׁ
אָמַר לָהּ בְּמָה הֵיטָּה טוֹמְאָתוֹ וְלֹא שִׁמְעָתִי מָה אָמַרָה לוֹ אָמְרוּ
חֲכָמִים מְבוֹאֵר הַדְּבָר אֵת שְׁנִיטְמָא בְּאֵב הַטּוֹמְאָה מִטָּמֵא אֵת
הַיָּדִים בּוֹלֵד הַטּוֹמְאָה אֵינוֹ מִטָּמֵא אֵת הַיָּדִים ג' כָּל הַפּוֹסֵל אֵת 3
הַתְּרוּמָה מִטָּמֵא אֵת הַיָּדִים לֵהוֹיֹת שְׁנִיּוֹת וְהֵיד מִטָּמֵא אֵת חֲבֵרְתָּהּ
דְּבַרִּי רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים אֵין שְׁנֵי עֲשֶׂה שְׁנֵי אָמַר לָהֶם
וְהִלּוֹא כְּתוּבִי הַקֹּדֶשׁ שְׁנִיִּים מִטָּמְאִים אֵת הַיָּדִים אָמְרוּ לוֹ אֵין דְּנִים
דְּבַרִּי תוֹרָה מְדַבְּרִי סוֹפְרִים וְלֹא דְּבַרִּי סוֹפְרִים מְדַבְּרִי תוֹרָה

ולא דברֵי סופְרים מדברֵי סופְרים ה' רצוּעוֹת תְּפִילִים עִם Yad. 3 4
 תְּפִילִים מִטְמָאוֹת אֶת הַיָּדִים רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר רצוּעוֹת תְּפִילִים
 אֵינָן מִטְמָאוֹת אֶת הַיָּדִים ה' גִּלְיוֹן שֶׁבֶסֶפֶר ⁴² שֶׁמֶלְמַעֲלָן וְשֶׁמֶלְמַטָּן 5
 וּשְׁבַתְחֵלָה וּשְׁבֶסוֹף מִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר שֶׁבֶסוֹף
 אֵינוֹ מִטְמָא עַד שִׁיעֲשֶׂה לוֹ עֲמוּד וְ סֵפֶר שְׁנִימַחֵק וְנִשְׁתִּייר בּוֹ 6
 שְׁמָנִים וְחֲמֵשׁ אוֹתִיּוֹת כִּפְרָשֶׁת וַיְהִי בִנְסַע הָאֲרוֹן ⁴³ מִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים
 מִגִּלְהָ שֶׁכְּתוּב בָּהּ שְׁמָנִים וְחֲמֵשׁ אוֹתִיּוֹת כִּפְרָשֶׁת וַיְהִי בִנְסַע הָאֲרוֹן
 אֵן מִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים וְכָל כְּתָבִי הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִטְמָאִים אֶת הַיָּדִים
 וְשִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים וְקִהְלָת מִטְמָאוֹת אֶת הַיָּדִים ה' רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר 7
 שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים מִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים וְקִהְלָת מִטְמָאוֹת רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר
 קִהְלָת אֵינָהּ מִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים וְשִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים מִחֲלוּקָתָהּ רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן
 אוֹמֵר קִהְלָתָהּ מִקּוּלֵי בֵּית שֹׁמֵי וּמַחֲוֹמְרֵי בֵּית הַלֵּל ה' אֵמֵר שִׁמְעוֹן 8
 בֶּן עֲזַאי מִקּוּבָל אֲנִי מִפִּי שְׁבָעִים וּשְׁנַיִם זָקֵן בְּיוֹם שֶׁהוֹשִׁיבוּ אֶת
 רַבִּי לַעֲזֹרָ ^{43a} בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה בִּישִׁיבָה שֶׁשִּׁיר הַשִּׁירִים וְקִהְלָת מִטְמָאוֹת
 אֶת הַיָּדִים ט' אִמֵּר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָה חָס וְשָׁלוֹם לֹא נִחְלַק אֲדָם 9
 מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל עַל שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים שֶׁלֹּא תִטְמָא אֶת הַיָּדִים שְׁאִין הָעוֹלָם
 כּוֹלּוֹ כְּדֹאֵי בְּיוֹם ⁴⁴ שְׁנִיתָנָה בּוֹ שִׁיר לְיִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁכָּל הַכְּתוּבִים
 קוֹדֶשׁ וְשִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים קוֹדֶשׁ קוֹדְשִׁים אִם נִחְלְקוּ לֹא נִחְלְקוּ אֵילָא
 עַל קִהְלָתָהּ אִמֵּר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן יִישׁוּעַ בֶּן חֲמִי שֶׁלְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָה
 דִּכְבְּרִי בֶּן עֲזַאי כֵּן נִחְלְקוּ וְכֵן גִּמְרוּ הֵנָּה פֶּרֶקָא ג' הִלְכְּתָא ט'
 פֶּרֶקָא ד' בּוֹ בְּיוֹם נִמְנוּ וְגִמְרוּ עַל עֲרִיבַת הָרִגְלִים שֶׁהָיָה מִשְׁנֵי 4 1
 לֹג וּשְׁלֹחַשְׁעַת קָבִים שְׁנִסְדְּקָהּ שֶׁהָיָה טְמֵאָה מִדְּרָס שֶׁרַבִּי עֲקִיבָה

⁴² Sic in the margin; in the text: שֶׁלְמַעֲלָן.

⁴³ Nu. 10.35 f.

^{43a} MS. לַעֲזֹרָ.

⁴⁴ On the margin: שְׁנִישְׁתָּנָה.

Yad. 4 2

אֹמֵר עֲרִיבַת הָרְגָלִים כְּשֶׁמָּה ב' בּוּ בְיוֹם אֲמָרוּ כָּל הַזֹּבָחִים
 שְׁנוּבָחוּ שְׁלֹא לִשְׁמֹן כְּשֶׁרִים אֵילָא שְׁלֹא עָלוּ לִבְעָלִים מִשֶּׁם
 חֻבָּה חוּץ מִן הַפֶּסַח וּמִן הַחֻטָּאת ⁴⁵וְלֹא הוֹסִיף בֶּן עֻזַּי אֵילָא
 עוֹלָה וְלֹא הוֹדּוּ לֹא חֲכָמִים ג' בּוּ בְיוֹם אֲמָרוּ עֵמּוֹן וּמוֹאֵב מֵה
 הֵן בְּשִׁבְעִית גִּזְרֵי רַבִּי טָרְפוֹן מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי וְגִזְרֵי רַבִּי לֵעֹזֵר בֶּן
 עֻזִּיָּה מַעֲשֶׂה שְׁנֵי אֲמָר רַבִּי טָרְפוֹן אֲלֵעֹזֵר בֶּן עֻזִּיָּה עָלֶיךָ הִרְאִינִי
 לִלְמַד שֶׁאֵתָּה מִחֲמִיר שְׁכָל הַמַּחְמִיר עָלֵינוּ הִרְאִינִי לִלְמַד ד' הִישִׁיב
 רַבִּי טָרְפוֹן מִצְרִים חוּץ לָאֶרֶץ וְעֵמּוֹן וּמוֹאֵב חוּץ לָאֶרֶץ מֵה
 מִצְרַיִם מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי בְּשִׁבְעִית אֶף עֵמּוֹן וּמוֹאֵב מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי בְּשִׁבְעִית
 ה' אֲמָר לוֹ רַבִּי אֲלֵעֹזֵר בֶּן עֻזִּיָּה יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל אַחִי אֲנִי לֹא שְׁנִיתִי
 מִסֵּדֶר הַשָּׁנִים רַבִּי טָרְפוֹן אַחִי ⁴⁶שִׁינָה וְעָלֵינוּ הִרְאִינִי לִלְמַד ו' הִישִׁיב
 רַבִּי לֵעֹזֵר בֶּן עֻזִּיָּה בָּבֶל חוּץ לָאֶרֶץ וְעֵמּוֹן וּמוֹאֵב חוּץ לָאֶרֶץ
 מֵה בָּבֶל מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי בְּשִׁבְעִית וְאֶף עֵמּוֹן וּמוֹאֵב מַעֲשֶׂה שְׁנֵי
 בְּשִׁבְעִית וְאָמְרוּ רַבִּי טָרְפוֹן מִצְרִים מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהָיָה מַעֲשֶׂה עֲשֹׂאָה
 מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי שֶׁהָיוּ עֲנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִסְמָכִים עָלֶיהָ בְּשִׁבְעִית וְאֶף עֵמּוֹן
 וּמוֹאֵב שֶׁהָיוּ קְרִיבִים נַעֲשִׂים מַעֲשֶׂה עֲנִי שֶׁהָיוּ עֲנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִסְמָכִים
 עָלֵיהֶם בְּשִׁבְעִית ה' אֲמָרוּ לוֹ רַבִּי אֲלֵעֹזֵר בֶּן עֻזִּיָּה הֲרִי אֲתָה
 כְּמֵהֵנָּה ⁴⁷מִמּוֹן וְאֵין אֲתָה אֵילָא כְּמַפְסִידִן נַפְשוֹת וְקוֹבֵעַ אֲתָה אֵת
 הַשָּׁמַיִם מִלְּהוֹרִיד טָל וּמִטֵּר שֶׁנִּי הִקְבַּע אֲדָם אֱלֹהִים כִּי אֲתָם
 קוֹבְעִים אוֹתִי וְאָמְרָתֶם בְּמָה קִבְּעוֹךְ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה וְהַתְּרוּמָה הִישִׁיב

⁴⁵ The greatest part missing here in the MS. is contained in Yeb 14; the text seems to be good as it is, but it may be that the copyist was misled here by the homoioteleuton (חוּץ מִן הַפֶּסַח וּמִן הַחֻטָּאת). But the whole following text is so different from this Vulgate text that the difference here also is to be expected.

⁴⁶ MS.: שְׁוִיָּה.

⁴⁷ On the margin: מֵאֲמוֹן.

לרבי טרפון ט אמר רבי יהושע הרי אני כמישיב על דברי רבי טרפון אחי אבל לא לעיני דבריו מצרים מעשה חדש ובבל מעשה ישן והנדרון שלפנינו מעשה חדש יידון מעשה חדש ממעשה חדש ואל יידון מעשה חדש ממעשה ישן מצרים מעשה זקנים ובבל מעשה נביאים והנדרון שלפנינו מעשה חדש יידון מעשה חדש לא יידון מעשה חדש ממעשה ישן מצרים מעשה זקנים ובבל מעשה נביאים והנדרון שלפנינו מעשה זקנים יידון מעשה זקנים ממעשה זקנים ואל יידון מעשה זקנים ממעשה נביאים נמנו וגמרו עמון ומואב מעשרין מעשר עני בשביעית ¹⁰ באותה שעה בכה רבי אליעזר ואמר סוד יי ליראיו ובריתו להודיעם צא ואמר להם אל תחושו למיניכם מקובל אני מרבך יוחנן בן זכאי ששמע מרבך ורבך מרבך הלכה למשה מסיני שעמון ומואב מעשרין מעשר עני בשביעית יא וכשבא רבי יוסה בן דרמסקית אצל רבי אליעזר ⁴⁸ ללמוד אמר לו מה חידוש היה לכם בבית המדרש היום אמר לו נימנו וגמרו עמון ומואב מעשרין מעשר עני בשביעית יב בו ביום עמד יהודה גר עמוני ועמד לפניהם בבית המדרש אמר להם מה אני לבוא בקהל אמר לו רבן גמליאל אסור אתה אמר לו רבי יהושע מותר אתה אמר לו רבן גמליאל הכתוב אמר לא יבוא עמוני ומואב בקהל יי עד עולם אמר לו רבי יהושע וכי עמונים ומואבים במקומן הן כבר עלה סנחריב מלך אשור ובילבל את כל האומות שנ ואסיר גבולות עמים ועתודותיהם שוסיתי ואוריד כאביר יושבים אמר לו רבן גמליאל והכתוב אמר ואחרי כן ⁴⁹ אשיב את שבות בני עמון כבראשונה כבר חזרו אמר לו רבי

⁴⁸ On the margin: ללוד.

⁴⁹ On the margin: ואחרי כן.

Yad. 4 12

13

14

15

16

יהושע והכתוב אמר ואשיב את שבות ישראל ויהודה אמר יי
 ועד אין לא שבו והתירוהו לבוא בקהל יג תרגום שבעזרא
 ושבדניאל מטמא את הידים תרגום שכתבו עיברית ועברו שכתבו
 תרגום כתב עברי אינו מטמא את הידים לעולם אינו מטמא
 עד שיכתבנו אשורית על העור בדיו יד אומרים צדוקים קובלים
 אנו עליכם פרושים שאתם אומרים כתבי הקדש מטמים את
 הידים וספרי המרס אינן מטמאים את הידים אמר רבן יוחנן
 בן זכאי אין לנו על הפרושים אלא זו בלבד⁵⁰ הרי⁵⁰ הן
 אומרים עצמות חמור טהורים ועצמות יוחנן כהן גדול טמאים
 אמרו... פני... טומאתם שלא יעשה אדם עצמות אביו
 ועצמות אמו תרודות אמר להם אף כתבי הקדש לפי חבתן
 היא טומאתן וספרי המרס שאין חביבים אין ומטמאים את
 הידים טו אומרים צדוקים קובלים אנו עליכם פרושים שאתם
 מטהרים ואתם הנצוק אומרים הפרושים קובלים אנו עליכם
 צדוקים שאתם מטהרים את אמת והמים הבאה מן הקברות
 אומרים צדוקים קובלים אנו עליכם פרושים מה אם שורי
 וחמורי שאין אני חייב בהם מצות הרי אני חייב בניזקן עברי
 ואמתי שאני חייב בהם במצוות אינו דין שאהיה חייב בניזקן
 אמרו להם לא אם אמרתם בשורי ובחמורי שאין בהם דעת
 תאמרו בעברי ובאמתי שיש בהם דעת שאם אקניטנו ילך וידלוק
 גדישו שלאחר ואהיה חייב לשלם יו אמר מן גלילי קובל אני
 עליכם פרושים שאתם כותבים את המשל עם מה⁵¹ שבגט אומרים

⁵⁰ On the margin.

⁵¹ מה is written on the right margin; before שבגט one letter is effaced, מ, as I suppose. On the left margin after עם is written a word, perhaps השם; that this word was found in MSS. is shown by Tosaphot, Baba Bathra 162a.

פרושים קובלים אנו עליך מן גלילי שאתם כותבים את המלך
 עם השם בדף ולא עוד⁵² אלא שאתם כותבים את המשל
 מלמעלן ואת השם מלמטן כענין שנ ויאמר פרעה מי יי אשר
 אשמע בקולו לשלח את ישראל לא ידעתי את יי וגם את ישראל
 לא אשלח הנא פרקא ד הלכתא ין חסלת ידים פרקי ארבעה

'Ukzin

עקצים פרקא קדמאה: כל שהוא יד ולא שומר מיטמא ומטמא
 ולא מצטרף שומר אף על פי שאינו יד מיטמא ומטמא ומצטרף
 ולא שומר ולא יד ולא מיטמא ולא מטמא ב שורשי השום
 והבצלים והקפליטות בזמן שהן לחים והפיטמה שלהם בין
 לחה בין יבישה והעמוד שהוא מכוון כנגד האוכל ושורשי⁵³
 החזירים והצנן והנפוס דברי רבי מאיר רבי יהודה אומר
 שורש צנן גדול מצטרף והסיב שלו אינו מצטרף שורשי המונתה
 והפיגם וירקות השדה וירקות גינה שעקרה לשתלים והשורה
 של שיבולת והלבוש שלה רבי אליעזר אומר אף הסיג⁵⁴ שלרצפות
 הרי אילו מיטמאים ומיצטרפים ג ואילו מיטמים ומטמאים ולא
 מצטרפים שורשי השום והבצלים והקפליטות בזמן שהן יבישים
 והעמוד שאינו מכוון כנגד האוכל ויד⁵⁵ הפרכור טפה מיכן
 וטפה מיכן ויד האישכול כל שהוא חנב שלאשכול שרקנה
 ויד⁵⁶ המכבד⁵⁷ שלתמרה ארבעה טפחים וקנה שלשיבולת

⁵² Added on the margin.

⁵³ Here was written הצנן, with dots above the letters.

⁵⁴ It may be that the vowel י was added later.

⁵⁵ At first it was written הפרכור, then the ר was changed into י.

⁵⁶ Originally מכבר, ד over ר, accordingly changed into מכבד.

⁵⁷ So on the margin; in the text: שלתרומה.

Ukzim 1 3

שְׁלֹשָׁה טַפְחִים וְיָד כָּל הַנִּקְצָרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה וּשְׁאִין דְּרִכָּן לְהִיקָצֵר
יְדֵיהֶם וּשְׁוֹרְשֵׁיהֶם כָּל שֶׁהֵן וּמִלְעִין^{57a} שְׁלִישִׁיבּוּלִים הָרִי אֵילוֹ מִטְמָאִים

וּמִטְמָאִים וְלֹא מִצְטָרְפִים דְּוָאֵילוֹ לֹא מִטְמָאִים וְלֹא מִטְמָאִים
וְלֹא מִצְטָרְפִים שׁוֹרְשֵׁי קוֹלְסִי כְּרֹב וְחִלְפֹת הַתְּרָדִים וְחִלְפֹת

אֶת שְׁדִירֵיהֶן לְהַיָּזִיז וְנִיעֲקְרוּ רַבִּי יוֹסֵה מִטְמֵא בְכוֹלָם וּמִטְמֵא
בְּשׁוֹרְשֵׁי קוֹלְסִי כְּרֹב וְחִלְפֹת הֵן כָּל יְדוֹת הָאוֹכְלִים שְׁבַסְאֶסֶן

בְּגוֹרֶן טְהוֹרִים רַבִּי יוֹסֵה מִטְמֵא וּפְסִיגָה שְׁלֹא שְׁרִיקָנָה
טְהוֹרָה שִׁיזְרָה גִּרְגֵר אֶחָד טְמֵאָה שְׂרִיבִט שְׁלֹתֶמְרָה שְׂרִיקָנָה

טְהוֹר שִׁיזְרָה בּוֹ תִמְרָה אַחַת טְמֵא וְכֵן בְּקִטְנִיּוֹת שְׂרִיבִט שְׂרִיקָנָה
טְהוֹר שִׁיזְרָה גִּרְגֵר אֶחָד טְמֵא רַבִּי לְעֹזֵר בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה וּמִטְמֵא בְּשִׁלְפֹל

וּמִטְמֵא⁵⁸ בְּשִׁלְקִיטְנִיּוֹת מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהוּא בְּמִשְׁמוֹשָׁן וְעוֹקְצֵי תַּאֲנִיִּים
וְגִרְגֵרֹת וְהַכְּלִיסִים וְהַחֲרוּבוֹים הָרִי אֵילוֹ מִטְמָאִים וּמִטְמָאִים^{58a}

וּמִצְטָרְפִים רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר אֵף עוֹקֵץ וְדִלְעַת עוֹקְצֵי הָאוֹגְסִים
וְהַקְרוֹצְטְמִילִים וְהַפְּרִישִׁין וְהַעֲזוֹרְדִין וְעוֹקֵץ דְּלַעַת טַפַּח וְעוֹקֵץ

וְקוֹנֵרֶס טַפַּח רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בִּירְבִּי צְדוֹק אוֹמֵר טִיפְחִיִּים הָרִי
אֵילוֹ מִטְמָאִים וּמִטְמָאִים וְלֹא מִצְטָרְפִים וּשְׁאִין כָּל הָעֵקֶצִים לֹא

מִטְמָאִים וְלֹא מִטְמָאִים הֵנָּה פֶּרֶקָא קְדָמָה הִלְכְתָּא וְפֶרֶקָא בָּן
וְיִיתִים שְׁכַבְשָׁן בְּטָרְפֵיהֶם טְהוֹרִים לְפִי שְׁלֹא כַבְשָׁן אֵילֹא לְמֵרְאָה

כְּשׁוֹת וְשִׁלְקִישׁוֹת וְהֵנָּה שְׁלֵהן טְהוֹר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר כָּל זֶמֶן
שֶׁהוּא לְפָנֵי הַתָּגֵר טְמֵאָה בְּכָל הַגִּלְעָנִים מִיטְמָאוֹת וּמִטְמָאוֹת

וְלֹא מִצְטָרְפֹת גִּלְעָנָה שְׁלֹא שְׁלֹא אֵף וְעַל פִּי יוֹצֵא מִצְטָרְפֹת
וְשְׁלִיבִישָׁה אֵינָה מִצְטָרְפֹת לְפִי כִּי חוֹתֵם שְׁלִיבִישָׁה מִצְטָרֵף

43b

^{57a} On the margin: ומעלין.

⁵⁸ It was written here בשלסיטנייות, above ■ is a ק, that is: "בשלק".

^{58a} MS. ומיטמאים, above the first י a stroke.

וּשְׁלֹרֹטֵב אֵינוֹ מִצְטָרִיף גַּלְעָנָה שֶׁמִּקְצָתָהּ יוֹצֵא כִנְגֹד הָאוֹכֵל מִצְטָרִיף 'Ukzim 2
 עֲצָם שֵׁשׁ עָלָיו בָּשָׂר שֶׁכִּנְגֹד הָאוֹכֵל מִצְטָרִיף הָיוּ עָלָיו מִצָּד
 אַחֵד רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל אוֹמֵר רוֹאִים אֹתוֹ כְּאִילוֹ הוּא מְקִיפוֹ בִּטְבַּעַת
 וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים שֶׁכִּנְגֹד הָאוֹכֵל מִצְטָרִיף כִּגּוֹן הַסִּיאָה וְהַאֲיוֹב
 3 וְהַקּוֹרְנִית גַּ' הָרִימוֹן וְהָאֲבִטִּיחַ שְׁנִימוֹק מִקְצָתוֹ אֵינוֹ מִצְטָרִיף שְׁלֵם
 מִיֵּכָן וּמִיֵּכָן וְנִימוֹק מִן הָאֲמָצֵעַ אֵינוֹ מִצְטָרִיף הַפּוֹטָמָה שֶׁלְרִימוֹן
 מִצְטָרֹפֶת וְזֶהְנֵץ שְׁלֹוֹ אֵינוֹ מִצְטָרִיף רַבִּי לְעֹזֵר אוֹמֵר וְאִף הַמֶּסֶרֶק
 4 טָהוֹר ה' כָּל הַקְּלִיפִים מִטְּמֹות וּמִטְּמָאוֹת וּמִצְטָרֹפֶת רַבִּי יְהוֹדָה
 אוֹמֵר שְׁלֹושׁ קְלִיפִים בְּבָצָל הַפְּנִימִית בֵּין שְׁלִימָה בֵּין קְדוּרָה
 מִצְטָרֹפֶת הָאֲמָצֵעִית שְׁלִימָה מִצְטָרֹפֶת וְקְדוּרָה אֵינָה מִצְטָרֹפֶת
 5 וְהַחֲיוֹנָה בֵּין כֶּךָ וּבֵין כֶּךָ טָהוֹרָה ה' הַמַּחֲתֵךְ לְבָשֵׁל אִף עַל פִּי
 שְׁלֹא מִדֶּרֶךְ אֵינוֹ חִיבוֹר לִיכְבוֹשׁ וּלְיִשְׁלוֹק וּלְהִנִּיחַ עַל הַשּׁוֹלְחָן
 חִיבוֹר הִתְחִיל מִפֶּרֶק אוֹכֵל שֶׁהִתְחִיל בּוֹ אֵינוֹ חִיבוֹר הָאֲיוֹנִים
 שֶׁאֵמָנן הַבָּצָלִים שֶׁחֲמָרָן הָרִי אֵילוֹ חִיבוֹר הִתְחִיל לִפְרֹט בְּאֲיוֹנִים
 וּלְפָקֵל בְּבָצָלִים אֵינָן חִיבוֹר הָאֲיוֹנִים וְהַשְּׁקִידִים חִיבוֹר ⁵⁹ מִשִּׁירָסֶם
 6 וְ בִיצָה מְגוֹלְגֶלֶת מִשִּׁירָסֶם וּשְׁלֹוקָה מִשִּׁירָסֶם עֲצָם שֵׁשׁ בּוֹ מוֹחַ
 חִיבוֹר עַד שִׁירָסֶם הָרִימוֹן שֶׁפָּרְדּוּ חִיבוֹר עַד שִׁיקִישׁ עָלָיו בִּקְנָה
 כִּיּוֹצָה בּוֹ שֶׁלְכּוֹבְסִים וְהַבְּגָד שֶׁהוּא תָפוֹר בְּכֹלָאִים חִיבוֹר עַד
 7 שִׁיתְחִיל לְהַחֲרִיף וְעָלִין יִרְקוֹת יִרְקוֹת מִצְטָרֹפִים לְבָנִים אֵינָן
 מִצְטָרֹפִים רַבִּי לְעֹזֵר בִּירְכֵי צָדוֹק אוֹמֵר לְבָנִים מִצְטָרֹפִים
 בְּאֶכְרוֹב מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהֵן אוֹכֵל וּבְחֻזְרוֹם מִפְּנֵי שֶׁאֵינָן מִשְׁמָרוֹם אֶת
 8 הָאוֹכֵל ה' עָלָה בָצָלִים וּבְנֵי בָצָלִים אִם יֵשׁ בָּהֶם רִיר מִצְטָרֹפִים
 לְכֻמוֹת שֶׁהֵן וְאִם יֵשׁ בָּהֶם חֲלָל מִמַּעַךְ אֶת חֲלָלָן פֶּת ⁶⁰ פֶּסְגָּנוֹת

⁵⁹ So here and two times in the next paragraph clearly in accordance with L and the Ed.-Kaufmann who even use the forms from רסם.

⁶⁰ So instead of ספונגנית, L ספונגנית.

'Ukzim 2 8

משתאִירָת לַכּמוֹת שֶׁהִיא אִם יֵשׁ בָּהּ חֵלֶל מִמַּעַךְ אֶת חֵלְלָה בָּשָׂר
 הָעֶגְל⁶¹ שְׁנִיתָפָח וּבִשָּׂר זָקִינָה שְׁנִית־מַעֲט מִשְׁתַּעְרִים לִיכְמוֹת שֶׁהֵן ט
 9
 קִישוֹת שְׁנִיתָה בְּעֶצֶיךָ הַגְדִּילָה יֵצֵאת חוּץ לַעֲצִיךָ טְהוּרָה אֲמַר רַבִּי
 שְׁמַעוֹן מִה טִיבָה לִיטְהַר אֵילָא הִטְמָא בְּטוֹמְאָתוֹ וְהִטְהוּר יֵיאָכֵל
 10
 י כָּלִי גַלְלִים⁶² וְכָלִי אֲדָמָה⁶³ שֶׁהִשְׁוֹרְשִׁים יֻכּוּלִים⁶⁴ לְהִישְׁרוֹת
 בָּהֶם אֵינָן מִכְשִׁירִים אֶת הַזְרָעִים עֲצִיךָ נָקוֹב אֵינּוּ מִכְשִׁיר אֶת
 הַזְרָעִים וּשְׁאֵינּוּ נָקוֹב מִכְשִׁיר אֶת הַזְרָעִים וְכַמָּה הוּא שְׁעוּרוֹ
 שְׁלֹנֶקֶב כַּדִּי שִׁיצָא בּוֹ שׁוֹרֵשׁ קָטָן מִלֵּאלָהּ עֶפֶר עַד שֶׁפָּתוֹ הָרִי
 3 1
 הוּא כְּטַבְלָה שְׁאֵין לָהּ לִזְבוֹן הֵנָּה פֶּרְקָא בִּי הִלְכְתָּא י פֶּרְקָא גִי יֵשׁ
 צְרִיכִים הַכֶּשֶׁר וְאֵינָן צְרִיכִים מִחֲשֶׁבָה מִחֲשֶׁבָה וְהַכֶּשֶׁר מִחֲשֶׁבָה
 וְלֹא הַכֶּשֶׁר לֹא מִחֲשֶׁבָה וְלֹא הַכֶּשֶׁר כָּל הָאוֹכְלִים הַמְּיוֹחָדִים
 2
 לְאָדָם צְרִיכִים הַכֶּשֶׁר וְאֵינָן צְרִיכִים מִחֲשֶׁבָה בִּי הַחוֹתֵךְ מִן
 הָאָדָם וּמִן הַבְּהֵמָה וּמִן הַחִיָּה וּמִן הָעוֹפּוֹת מִנְּבִלַת הָעוֹף הִטְמָא
 וְהַחֲלָב בְּכַפְרִים וּשְׂאֵר כָּל יִרְקוֹת הַשְּׂדֵה חוּץ מִשְׁמַרְקָעִים וּפְטָרִיתוֹ
 רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר חוּץ מִכְרִישֵׁי הַשְּׂדֵה וְהַרְגִּילָה וְנֵץ הַחֲלָב רַבִּי
 שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר חוּץ מִן הָעֶכְבָּיוֹת רַבִּי יוֹסֵה אוֹמֵר חוּץ מִן הַבְּלִיסִים
 3
 הָרִי אֵילוֹ צְרִיכִים מִחֲשֶׁבָה וְהַכֶּשֶׁר גִּי נִבְלַת בַּהֲמָה טְהוּרָה בְּכָל
 מְקוֹם וְנִבְלַת הָעוֹף הַטְהוּר וְהַחֲלָב בְּכַפְרִים צְרִיכִים מִחֲשֶׁבָה
 נִבְלַת בַּהֲמָה טְמֵאָה בְּכָל מְקוֹם וְנִבְלַת הָעוֹף הִטְמָא בְּחֲלָב
 וְלֹא מִחֲשֶׁבָה וְלֹא הַכֶּשֶׁר רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר וְאֵף הַגְּמֵל וְהָאֲרָנָבֶת
 4
 וְהַשֶּׁפֶן וְהַחֲזִיר ד הִשְׁבַּת מִשְׁנַתְּנָה טַעַם בְּקִדְרֵיהּ אֵין בָּהּ מִשֶּׁם
 תְּרוּמָה וְאֵינָה טְמֵאָה ...

⁶¹ שְׁנִיתָפָח was here wrongly written; there are dots above the letters.

⁶² י added above the line.

⁶³ The 2nd ש above the line; the whole word is repeated correctly on the margin.

⁶⁴ Inf. Nif. of שרי.

THE DEATH OF ZECHARIAH IN RABBINIC LITERATURE

SHELDON H. BLANK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati

COMMENTARIES on the book of Zechariah¹ frequently refer to the belief which once prevailed that the prophet met a violent end in the Temple which he was instrumental in building. The most familiar example of the mention of this tradition is the New Testament passage Matth. 23.34f., where Jesus is represented as saying: "Therefore, behold, I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes. Some of them you shall kill and crucify; and some of them you shall scourge in your synagogues, and hunt them from city to city. In order that there may come upon you all the righteous blood slain upon the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous to the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom you slew between the shrine and the altar." A less familiar example but one no less pointed is to be found in the Targum to Lam. 2.20. There, after rendering the words: "Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord?," the Targumist adds the comment: "As you killed Zechariah the son of Iddo, the High Priest and faithful prophet in the sanctuary of the Lord on the Day of Atonement because he admonished them not to do what was displeasing to the Lord."² Early Christian authors³ refer to the same tradition.

¹ Cf., e. g.: ICC p. 83f.; Geo. Adam Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* II, p. 266, n. 1; *et al.*

² וכן אמרת אם חזי למקטל בבית מוקדשא דיי כהנא ונביא, כמה דקטלתון ית זכריה בר עדו כהנא רבא ונביא מהימן בבית מוקדשא דיי ביומא דכפוריא על דאוכא יתהון דלא תעבדון דביש קדם יי

³ Cf. (Pseudo-)Epiphanius, *Vitae prophetarum* (cod. Augustanus) in Migne *Patrologiae Graeca* XLIII, p. 411f., n. 55 and Sozomenus, *Ecclesiastica historia* Book IX, ch. 17 in Migne *Patr. Gr.* LXVII, p. 1628f. (see footnotes 13 and 15 below); also Köhler, Aug., *Die nachexilischen Propheten, Der Weissagungen Sacharjas erste Hälfte*, Erlangen 1861, p. 10f.; ICC. to Zech., p. 83. [Berendts, A., *Studien über Zacharias-Apokryphen und Zacharias-Legenden*, Leipzig, 1895—see below, n. 26.]

In order to gain clarity with regard to this peculiar belief it is necessary to observe the confusion that arose with regard to three of the persons mentioned in the Old Testament who bore the name of Zechariah. The first of these in point of time is the Zechariah the son of Jehoiada who, according to 2 Chr. 24.17-22, was stoned in the Temple at the command of the king Joash. The second is Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah whom, along with Uriah the priest, Isaiah named as a witness to the large tablet he inscribed with the words: *maher-šalal-ḥaš-baz* (Isa. 8.1f.). The third is the Zechariah who gave his name to the prophetic book.

This third Zechariah is three times referred to in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah⁴; and although there his name is always given as Zechariah the son of Iddo and in the book of Zechariah it is Zechariah the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo (Zech. 1.1), there can be no doubt that the same person is intended by both designations. The only question is why in his book he is referred to as Zechariah the son of Berechiah the son of Iddo and otherwheres merely as Zechariah the son of Iddo, that is to say, in the one case as the grandson of Iddo, in the other as his son. Two plausible answers have been offered. The one is that Iddo was really the grandfather of Zechariah and was a person of some importance, so that Zechariah is referred to briefly as his son in the notices in Ezra and Nehemiah. This explanation could be correct, at least as far as Neh. 12.16 is concerned. There, indeed, the heads of the priestly families are mentioned along with the representative of each family in the generation under consideration; moreover it seems to be right that a more distant descendant is, on rare occasions, referred to as a "son."⁵ But there is no good reason why, in the two Ezra passages Zechariah should have been referred to as the son of Iddo if, in fact, he was his grandson. The second and more plausible answer is that Zechariah was indeed the son of Iddo and that the insertion of Berechiah between Zechariah and Iddo in Zech. 1.1 is evidence of an erroneous attempt to identify Zechariah the prophet with the second of the three Zechariahs, Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, Isaiah's "faithful witness." That this is correct I think no one will doubt

⁴ Ezra 5.1; 6.14; Neh. 12.16.

⁵ Gen. 24.28, 47 (cf. 29.5); 1 Ki. 19.16 (cf. 2 Ki. 9.14, 20).

who observes the extent to which the three Zechariah's were subsequently confused—"subsequently" because there is no evidence in the versions to suggest that the words "son of Berechiah" were not already present in the texts from which the translations were made. On the other hand the identification must be later than the time of the Chronicler who is responsible for the references to Zechariah in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and who refers to him merely as "Zechariah the son of Iddo."

We thus regard the words "the son of Berechiah" in Zech. 1.1 as an early gloss intended to identify Zechariah the prophet with the second Zechariah, Isaiah's witness. These two Zechariah's are similarly identified in an haggadic passage in b. Mak. 24b: "On another occasion," this passage states, "certain rabbis were going to Jerusalem. When they reached Mt. Scopus they rent their garments. When they reached the temple mount they saw a fox coming from the Holy of Holies. They began weeping. But R. Aḳiba laughed. They said to him: 'Why are you laughing?' He said to them: 'Why are you weeping?' They said to him: 'There is a place where it is written: The stranger who draws nigh shall be put to death (Nu. 1.51); and now foxes go about in it, and should we not weep?' He said to them: 'I am laughing for the following reason: It is written: And I called me faithful witnesses, Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Berechiah (Isa. 8.2). And what connection is there between Uriah and Zechariah? Uriah lived at the time of the first Temple, and Zechariah at the time of the second. This is the connection: Scripture makes the prophecy of Zechariah depend upon the prophecy of Uriah. Of Uriah it is written: Therefore because of you Zion will be ploughed as a field and in Zechariah it is written: Old men and old women shall yet dwell in the streets of Jerusalem (Zech. 8.14). Until the prophecy of Uriah was fulfilled I feared that the prophecy of Zechariah would not be fulfilled.' At this word they said: 'Aḳiba you have comforted us, Aḳiba you have comforted us.' " The passage is not without its difficulties⁶ but this much is clear: that

⁶ The words ascribed to Uriah: *לכן בגללכם ציון שדה תהרש*, are found in this form in Mic. 3.12 in a prophecy ascribed to Micah. They are cited in Jer. 26.18 with the omission of *לכן בגללכם* and are, moreover, there also ascribed to Micah. However, in this same chapter in Jeremiah, in close proximity to the words

Aḳiba here identifies Zechariah the prophet with the Zechariah whom Isaiah names as a witness to the truth of his words. Not that he makes Zechariah the prophet a contemporary of Isaiah—he explicitly states that the Zechariah whom he has in mind lived at the time of the second Temple. He seems to have meant that Isaiah chose as his witnesses not only a contemporary priest but also a prophet who was to arise some two centuries later and justify his teachings.

This story from the Talmud throws light upon the gloss in Zech. 1.1, which proposes the same identification. In view of the narrative we may conclude that what the glossator intended to suggest was that Isaiah did actually choose this post-Exilic prophet to be his witness.⁷ If this is what the glossator meant to say, though his historical sense may have been weak he showed a remarkable penetration into the spirit of Isaiah's prophecies. Isaiah's message was, indeed, not for his own day as he himself knew only too well, but for the century which followed the national disaster, the age of Zechariah the prophet.

A different confusion appears in the Midrash⁸ which records that Uriah the priest and Zechariah were killed in the Temple apparently (since Zechariah and Uriah are here paired) confusing

ascribed to Micah, the statement occurs (v. 20): "There was also a man that prophecied in the name of the Lord, Uriah the son of Shemaiah of Kiriath-jearim; and he prophecied against this city and against this land according to all the words of Jeremiah" (as to "all the words of Jeremiah" cf. v. 9: "This house shall be like Shiloh, and this city shall be desolate without an inhabitant"). Aḳiba apparently had in mind this Uriah whom he supposed to be identical with Uriah the priest of Isa. 8.2. However he, or more probably a later commentator, perhaps citing from memory, erroneously attributed to Uriah words assigned, in this chapter in Jeremiah, to Micah, making the further mistake of quoting them in the form in which they appear in the book of Micah (unless, of course, the words *לכן בוללכם* stood also in Jer. 26.18 when Aḳiba, or the commentator, quoted them, and have since then been lost).

⁷ Dorotheus fell prey to the same confusion. In a paragraph on Zechariah the prophet, he states: *ἔστι Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βαραχίου, οὗ μὲνεται Ὑσαῖας* (cited in Th. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden*, Leipzig 1907, p. 71, l. 2f.; cf. Geo. Adam Smith *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*)

⁸ Cf. Eccles. r. (ed. Wilna 86b) to Eccles. 3.16 (מקום המשפט שמה הרשע): "In the place of justice . . . there they killed Zechariah and Uriah." Also Pesikta de R. Ḳahana (in Buber's *Midrashim Ḳeṣanim*, p. 217): צרק ילין בה מה טעם, צרק ילין בה? (Isa. 1.21) הא עבדין קשולין הרנו את אוריה הכהן הרנו את זכריה ועתה מרצחים.

Isaiah's witness, Zechariah, with the priest of like name whom the people stoned in the Temple, a confusion between the first Zechariah and the second.

Finally we find that Zechariah the priest was confused with Zechariah the prophet—the first with the third Zechariah. This confusion is responsible for the tradition to which we referred at the outset, the tradition that Zechariah the prophet was slain in the Temple. With regard to the passage in Matthew which speaks of "the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom you slew between the shrine and the altar," it is significant that in Luke (11.50) it reads merely "the blood of Zachariah, who was slain between the altar and the house."^{8a} If this be the original text we are at liberty to choose whichever of the several Zechariah's best suits the situation; and our obvious choice is the first of the three—Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest whom the people stoned in the Temple at the command of Joash. This conclusion, as others have pointed out, furnishes us with the most probable explanation of the expression "from the blood of Abel the righteous to the blood of Zechariah." Abel is mentioned at the beginning of Genesis, Zechariah the priest at the end of Second Chronicles, and, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible, the one is at the beginning, the other at the end of the Old Testament. "Throughout the course of your entire history, from the first instance of the spilling of innocent blood to the last"—that is the clear meaning of the phrase. Incidentally, it is interesting to observe with regard to the Old Testament canon that in those days the arrangement of the books appears to have been that of the Hebrew Bible.

The solution of the difficulty in Matthew by assuming that the Zechariah in question was Zechariah the son of Jehoiada is a solution referred to by Jerome, who found the reading "son of Jehoiada" in place of "son of Barachiah" in the Nazarene Gospel.⁹

^{8a} According to the ICC to Matthew, p. 251 *υἱοῦ Βαραχίου* is omitted also in Matth. 23 in ^{*} 613.

⁹ Cf. Jerome's commentary on Matthew: "In evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni pro filio Barachiae filium Joiadae reperimus scriptum" (Migne, *Patrologiae Latina* XXVI, p. 180C).

One recension of Epiphanius' *Vitae prophetarum* says of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada: *υἱὸς δὲ Ἰωδαῆ ἱερέως, ὃν καὶ ἐκάλονν Βαραχίαν* (D¹—an anonymous

Probably, however, the original text had merely Zechariah, as in Luke, and both definitions are glosses—the one correct, the other false. The false gloss is interesting: "Zechariah the son of Barachiah" is most like the name of the second Zechariah, Isaiah's witness; but we cannot believe that he was intended. There is no other suggestion that he was believed to have died a martyr's death. The gloss must certainly intend Zechariah the prophet, who, as his name now reads in Zech. 1.1, was, like Isaiah's witness, the son of a Berechiah.¹⁰ As we have already observed the Tar-

tenth century writer) and: filius Joiadae sacerdotis qui et Barachias cognominatus est (Li = Isidore of Seville). (Cf. Schermann *op. cit.*, p. 106. For the meaning of the sigla *ibid.*, pp. 45, 17, and 23. For the evaluation and dates of the writings *ibid.*, p. 128f.). So also Jerome, *loc. cit.* The statement that Berechiah is only another name for Jehoiada may be an attempt to identify the priest who was slain in the days of Joash with Zechariah the prophet but it probably reflects a feeling on the part of the author of this recension of the *Vitae* and Jerome that the Zechariah of Matth. 23.35 was Zechariah the son of Jehoiada.

¹⁰ Jossipon (Ch. 80, mid.): ואיך בחוכך נפלו כהני יי ונביאיו, ולפני היכל הקדש אשר בחוכך נשחט זכריה הנביא הצדיק והחסיד. וישכב בלא קבר, ולא כסתה הארץ את דמו, אבל עדיין הוא עולה ומצפצף בחוכך זכריה הנביא אשר. In common with the Zechariah legend (see below p. 338) it has the uncovered blood which, being unavenged, was not at rest, and the murder in the Temple. Consequently Zechariah the son of Jehoiada is here called a prophet, or else—and this is more likely—this writer also is confused as to which of these two Zechariah's is the subject of the legend.

But the confusion goes deeper than this. The passage in Jossipon continues: ואיך כסתה ארצך דם ענני הכהן הגדול ודם יהושע אשר בכהנת הקדש. The obvious source for this remark is Josephus Wars IV, 5.2-4. There Josephus describes the death of Ananus, the high priest, Jesus (Joshua b. Gamala) and a Zacharias, son of Baris (or Bariscaeus) in the Temple at the hands of the Zealots and Idumaeans during the Roman siege of Jerusalem in the year 68 C. E. This Zacharias, a wealthy citizen of Jerusalem in the time of Vespasian, has nothing whatever to do with either Zechariah the prophet or Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. That he died in the Temple as did the priest Zechariah is merely a coincidence. Jossipon, acquainted, as it seems, with the legend of the older Zechariah, confused the two and borrowed details from the legend to embellish his reference to the contemporary of Josephus.

Graetz, however, finds in Josephus' story of Zechariah the son of Baris the incident to which allusion is made in Matth. 23.35 (*Gesch. d. Juden* III, Leipzig, 1888, p. 515, n. 2). Similarly, Marti (*Der Prophet Sacharja* 1892, p. 58f.) and Geo. Adam Smith (*op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*) suggest that this occurrence

gumic commentator appears to agree with this glossator that Zechariah the prophet was slain in the Temple. He calls him (Lam. 2.20) Zechariah the son of Iddo—the name he bears in Ezra. But he refers to him as a high priest, a designation which could have been applied to the first Zechariah, but not at all to Zechariah the prophet.¹¹ Here, too, an error appears to have crept in—possibly merely an error made by an unlearned scribe who wrote עָרָו for יְהוּדָע,¹² by no means a difficult exchange. Among the Zechariahs of the Old Testament the Zechariah who gave his name to the biblical book was no doubt the one with whom readers were the most familiar, and it is not strange that he should thus carelessly have been read into the two passages Matth. 23.35 and the Targum to Lamentations. The editor who is responsible for the addition in the codex Augustanus to (Pseudo-) Epiphanius was probably influenced by the erroneous gloss in Matthew, rather than by any independent tradition.¹³

may have been responsible at least for the insertion of the name Barachiah into Matth. 23.35. But cf. Thackeray's note to the passage in Josephus (Loeb Classical Library edition, Vol. III, 1928, p. 98f.): The father's name is Baris or Bariscaeus, not Baruch; and Baruch only *resembles* Barachiah.

¹¹ The statement that "he admonished (the people) not to do what was displeasing to the Lord" is probably based upon 2 Chr. 24.18–20. Cf. below, n. 13.

¹² As a matter of fact, in a parallel passage (Midr. r. to Lam. 2.20, ed. Wilna 49b) the slain man is appropriately designated Zechariah the son of Jehoiada: אַם יִהְיֶה בְּמִקְדָּשׁ יְיָ כֵּהֵן וְנִבְיָא: זֶה זְכַרְיָה בֶן יְהוּדָע.

¹³ Cf. above, n. 3.—Th. Schermann, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* (Leipzig 1907, pp. 1–133) has assembled the varied manuscript material available for a study of the complicated textual problem involved in a discussion of Epiphanius' *Vitae prophetarum*, and we shall cite his edition and employ his sigla in the following. An earlier attempt at arriving at a better text than that in Migne is to be found in E. Nestle, *Marginalien und Materialien* (Tübingen, 1893). The possibility that the *Vitae* goes back to a Hebrew original increases our interest in this source in a study of the rabbinic legends (cf. Schermann, p. 132f.). Nestle (p. 46) and Schermann (p. 16 and 128) agree that the earliest form of the Greek translation of a problematic Hebrew original is preserved in the codex Marchalianus-Claromontanus (Vat. 2125—Nestle's Q and Schermann's D). It is important to keep this in mind because it is in this earlier text that reference is made to two of the three Old Testament Zechariahs with whom we are concerned—to Zechariah the prophet, and to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. In many of the later recensions Zechariah the

It becomes evident therefore that only confusion is responsible for any supposed data concerning the martyrdom of the prophet Zechariah. Zechariah the priest, the son of Jehoiada, however, figures large in rabbinic legend and we turn now to a consideration of the material concerning him.

son of Jehoiada is confused with Zechariah the father of John the Baptist (cf. Luke 1), which greatly obscures the situation. The section on the life of Zechariah the prophet, with the manuscript variants, is to be found in Schermann on p. 70ff., the section on Zechariah the son of Jehoiada (and Zechariah the father of John the Baptist) on p. 105ff.

The section on Zechariah the prophet contains the addition from the cod. Augustanus cited by Migne (cf. above n. 3). This addition is remarkably like the section on Zechariah the son of Jehoiada in D (cf. Schermann, p. 71, ll. 6-13 with p. 106, ll. 1-10 and n. to ll. 2 and 3). It was doubtless borrowed from the latter section and added to the section on Zechariah the prophet by a writer who confused the two Zechariah's, probably under the influence of the erroneous gloss in Matthew (cf. also n. 34, below, and Schermann p. 72). The words *παραινοῦντα αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀνέχεσθαι τῆς ἀσεβείας καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν πρὸς θεόν*, which appear in the paragraph of the cod. Augustanus and not in D and which constitute the main difference between the two texts, may well have had their place in the original in the paragraph on Zechariah the son of Jehoiada and should probably be restored there. They are to be compared with the words "על דאזכח יתהון דלא חעברון דביש קדם" in the Targum passage (cf. notes 2 and 11 above), and they, too, are an appropriate description of the message of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada.

The confusion of this Zechariah with the father of John the Baptist is only another example of the far-reaching confusion among the several Zechariah's of the Bible to which people fell prey in the early Christian centuries. According to Schermann (p. 107), the father of John was identified also by Tertullian and Chrysostom with the Zechariah of Matth. 23.35. Cf. also Jerome: Migne, *Patr. Lat.* XXVI, p. 180B.

Aside from the significant fact of this (two-sided) confusion among the Zechariahs in the several codices of the *Vit. proph.*, once our attention is drawn to the New Testament Zechariah we must pause to note that, according to Luke, this Zechariah was offering incense in the Temple when the angel appeared to him to announce the birth of John the Baptist. He was inspired with fear and struck dumb. The people waited in trepidation, and when he came out they realized that he had seen a vision. This is very like the rabbinic tradition that it was a time of peril for the high-priest when he entered the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement to offer incense, a tradition to which we shall presently refer in connection with the targumic statement that the first Zechariah was a high-priest and that he was stoned on the Day of Atonement (cf. n. 31, below). [Berendts (p. 32f.—see below, n. 26) calls attention to

Zechariah the son of Jehoiada is not mentioned in the books of Kings. In fact the passage in 2 Chr. 24 is the only one in the Old Testament in which he is mentioned. This fact casts doubt upon the historicity of the entire incident although it is of course possible that, for some reason or other,¹⁴ it was deleted from the parallel history in 2 Ki. 12. The Chronicles account reads as follows (vv. 17–22): “Now after the death of Jehoiada came the princes of Judah and prostrated themselves before the king. Then the king hearkened unto them. And they forsook the house of the Lord, the God of their fathers and served the Asherim and the idols; and wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for this their guiltiness. Yet he sent prophets to them, to bring them back to the Lord; and they admonished them, but they would not give ear. And the spirit of God clothed Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest; and he stood above the people and said to them: ‘Thus saith God: Why transgress ye the commandments of the Lord, that ye cannot prosper? because ye have forsaken the Lord He hath also forsaken you.’ And they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king in the

a later development of this tradition according to which Zechariah lost his life as a remote consequence of having entered the Holy of Holies without the bells which should have been suspended from the hem of his robe. These bells being absent, the deity in the sanctuary had no warning of his approach, and had not withdrawn when the High Priest entered. Thus Zechariah discovered that the deity had the form of an ass. He was, thereupon, struck dumb, but when he regained his speech he told what he had seen, and lost his life as a consequence (quoted by Epiphanius of Salamis from a book entitled *Γέννα Μαρίας*, which he claims to have seen in Egypt cir. 340 C. E.). This is similar to the reason given in b. Yeb. 49b for the execution of the prophet Isaiah by Menasseh: מנשה הרג את ישעיה. אמר רבא: מדין דייניה וקטליה, אמר ליה: משה רבך מנשה הרג את ישעיה. אמר רבא: מדין דייניה וקטליה, ואמר: וארא את ה' יושב על כסא דם ונשא. Also Sanh. 103b.]

Of further significance here is the material in Epiphanius concerning the immediate consequences of the murder of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. Terrifying sights were seen in the Temple, the priests were robbed of vision, oracles ceased. This was the writer's view of the sequel to the crime.

Of interest also is the statement in B (Dorotheus) that the *house of David* spilled the *blood* of Zechariah in the midst of the Temple porch (αἷλαμ = אולם). This may suggest that the author knew likewise of the sequel referred to by Sozomenus (cf. below, n. 15) or of that of the talmudic legend (below, p. 338 and notes 16 and 34).

¹⁴ Because of the favorable judgment of Joash expressed in v. 3?

court of the house of the Lord. Thus Joash the king remembered not the kindness which Jehoiada his father had done to him but slew his son. And when he died, he said: "The Lord look upon it, and require it." "

It is not to be wondered at that a narrative which ends as this narrative does should have a sequel. When Zechariah died he said: "The Lord look upon it, and require it (וְיִרְשֵׁנוּ)." The sequel must relate the fashion in which the Lord exacted punishment for this reprehensible deed.¹⁵ Even as the blood of

¹⁵ One such sequel appears in the continuation of the narrative itself (2 Chr. 24.23-27). When, at the turn of the year, the army of Aram attacked Judah and Jerusalem, and a small force was able to prevail against a mighty force, this was the Lord's doing: he forsook them because they had forsaken him (כִּי עָזְבוּ אֹתוֹ—v. 24), thus fulfilling the words of Zechariah in v. 20: כִּי עֲזָבָה אֶת יְיָ וַיַּעֲזֹב אֹתָם. The Syrians executed judgment (עָשׂוּ שְׁפָטִים) upon Joash as well, and left him in great distress. But that was not the end of the matter. Two of his servants conspired against him (again measure for measure, cf. v. 25: וְשְׁנֵי עֲבָדָיו הִקְשִׁירוּ עִלָּיו in v. 21) and killed him in his bed "for the blood of the son (בֶּן—dittogr.) of Jehoiada the priest." (Rashi to v. 25 observes that the death of Zechariah and that of Joash were similar also in that neither suspected the treachery which destroyed him—Zechariah relying on his respected position as the son of Jehoiada and Joash resting peaceably upon his bed.)

In the Mekilta de R. Ishmael (*Amalek* I; ed. Lauterbach, Philadelphia 1933, Vol. II, p. 138) tradition increases the indignity done to Joash by the Syrians: "Read not: 'judgments' (*Shefatim*) but 'sports' (*shipputum*). And what 'sports' did they practice upon him. They say: They appointed over him cruel guards who had never in their life known a woman, and they tortured him with pederasty." This remark, with minor variations, is cited in the Talmud (j. *Kid.* I, 7—61a) with the introductory formula תַּנִּי ר' יִשְׁמַעֵאל. This Ishmael is the tanna of the first and second centuries to whom the Mekilta was ascribed. In the same Mekilta passage allusion is made to 2 Chr. 24.26 which identifies the servants who conspired against Joash as a son of an Ammonitess and a son of a Moabitess. In rabbinic tradition Moab and Ammon were symbols for ingratitude and it was fitting that these ungrateful ones should come and punish Joash the ungrateful one, who "did not remember the kindness which Jehoiada, his father had done to him, but slew his son" (יָבֹאוּ אֵלָיו כַּפְּרִי טוֹבָה) (ויפּרעוּ מִן יוֹאָשׁ כַּפּוּי טוֹבָה). (For this whole tradition cf. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* IV, Philadelphia 1913, p. 258f.; VI, 1928, p. 354f., n. 16.)

A totally different sequel is quoted in Sozomenus *Ecclesiastica historia* Book IX, ch. 17 (Migne *Patrologiae Graeca* Vol. LXVII, p. 1628f.; English translation by Chester A. Hartranft, in *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, II, N. Y., 1890). Sozomenus (400-443 C. E.) relates that in the reign

Abel cried unto God from the ground so the blood of Zechariah cried to Him for vengeance from the pavement of the Temple where he had been stoned.¹⁶ The association of the death of

of Valentinian (III, 425–455 C. E.), a serf in Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin) had a dream which led him to the discovery of the burial place of Zechariah. (Sozomenus refers to him as “Zechariah, the very ancient prophet” in ch. 16, and, in ch. 17, as “the divine prophet,” and, several times, “the prophet,” but he is either using the term loosely or confusing Zechariah the prophet with Zechariah the priest the son of Jehoiada [see above, p. 331 ff.] to whom alone the further statements could apply. Moreover “the divine prophet” was “clad in a white stole” which suggested to Sozomenus that he was a priest.) “At his feet,” says the historian, “outside of the coffin, was lying a child which had been honored with a royal burial; for on its head was a golden crown, its feet were incased in golden sandals, and it was arrayed in a costly robe.” The puzzling matter was clarified by the discovery of “an ancient document written in Hebrew, which had not been received among the canonical books (Ἑβραϊὰ καὶ παλαιὰ περιτυχεῖν γραφῇ, οὐ τῶν ἐκκλησιαζομένων). In this document it was stated that when Zechariah the prophet had been put to death by Joash, king of Judah, the family of the monarch was soon visited by a dire calamity; for on the seventh day after the death of the prophet, one of the sons of Joash, whom he tenderly loved, suddenly expired. Judging that this affliction was a special manifestation of Divine wrath, the king ordered his son to be interred at the feet of the prophet, as a kind of atonement for the crime against him.”

The legendary character of the incident is evident. A further indication thereof is contained in the final statement, that the body of “the prophet” had in no wise suffered from being entombed for many generations. It is the explanation of the curious find which chiefly interests us. The explanation is based upon an *ancient, Hebrew* document. This points to a *rabbinic* interest in the sequel to the stoning of Zechariah and likewise dates this version of the sequel in the fourth century, or before, depending upon how far we may press the term “ancient.” This version, like those in Chronicles and the Mekilta, exacts measure for measure, the life of the son of Joash atoning for the life of the son of Jehoiada. (With slight modifications the story is repeated in Nicephorus Callistus Xantopulus, *Ecclesiasticae historiae* Book XIV, ch. 8—Migne, *Patrologiae Graeca* CXLVI, p. 1080f.)

¹⁶ Cf. j. Ta'an. IV, 9 (69ab): R. Aḥa says: “They did not treat his blood as the blood of the gazelle or the hart, about which it is said: He shall pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust’ (Lev. 17.13). But so: ‘Her blood is in the midst of her, she set it upon the bare rock’ (Ezek. 24.7). And why all of this? ‘That it might cause fury to come up, that vengeance might be taken, I have set her blood upon the bare rock that it should not be covered’ (Ezek. 24.8).” This rabbinic comment motivates the Talmudic legend which follows. The uncovered blood on the bare rock had to be avenged. Cf. above, n. 13 end. —After a visit to Jerusalem in the year 333 C. E. the pilgrim from Bordeaux

this Zechariah with that of Abel in the Gospels is thoroughly logical.

The most interesting sequel is to be found in the Talmud: The innocent blood of the slain Zechariah had no rest. For all of two hundred and fifty years it was perturbed. Then, "when Nebuzaradan went up to the spot (in the Temple, where the priest had been slain) he saw the blood boiling. He asked (the Jews): 'what is the meaning of this?' They said to him: 'It is the blood of bullocks, sheep and rams that we have offered on the altar.' He promptly brought bullocks and sheep and slaughtered them upon it. But the blood still boiled (or, according to another version:¹⁷ the blood of the animals sacrificed did not *match* the boiling blood). And when they would not confess to him the truth he hanged some of them on the gallows. So they thought: 'It seems that God wishes to require his blood at our hands.' And they told him: 'It is the blood of a priest and prophet and judge who prophesied to us all that you are doing to us and we arose against him and slew him.' He promptly brought 80,000 young priests and slaughtered them upon it (the altar), and still the blood boiled. Thereupon Nebuzaradan became angry with Zechariah. He said to him: 'What do you want? Should we kill your whole people for your sake?' Thereupon the Lord was filled with compassion and said: 'If this man, who is but flesh and blood and is cruel, is filled with such compassion for My children . . . how much the more should I be so.' Accordingly He made a sign to the blood and it subsided into its place." The incident

wrote as follows: "In the building itself where stood the temple which Solomon built, they say that the blood of Zacharias which was shed upon the stone pavement before the altar remains to this day. There are also to be seen the marks of the nails in the shoes of the soldiers who slew him, throughout the whole enclosure, so plain that you would think they were impressed upon wax." (Quoted by Zev Vilnay from the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, ed. P. Geyer. *Itinera Hierosolymitana* [1898] p. 22. The translation is that of Vilnay in *Legends of Palestine*, Philadelphia 1932, p. 110.) Jerome, too, tells, in his commentary on Matthew 23, that red stones stained with the blood of Zechariah were shown among the ruins of the Temple: Migne, *Patrologiae Latina*, XXVI, p. 181A: *Simpliciores fratres inter ruinas templi et altaris, sive in portarum exitibus, quae Siloam ducunt, rubra saxa monstrantes, Zachariae sanguine putant esse polluta.*

¹⁷ In b. Giṭ. 57b top.

made such an impression upon the cruel Babylonian war lord that he went home, arranged his affairs and became a convert to Judaism.¹⁸

This narrative appears to have possessed a fascination for the rabbinic authors because it is repeated again and again in the literature with various alterations and embellishments. In one version,¹⁹ instead of hanging some of the people, Nebuzaradan threatened to comb their flesh with combs of iron in order to wring their confession from them,²⁰ and instead of 80,000 young priests he slaughtered on the altar a great sanhedrin, a minor sanhedrin and young men and maidens, climaxing the gory business by slaying children from the schools. In still another version²¹ the number of those who atoned for the death of Zechariah in the blood bath of Nebuzaradan is placed at 940,000.²²

¹⁸ Jer. Ta'an. IV, 9 (69ab).—Josephus (Antt. XI, 7.1) contains a significant parallel. After reporting that Johanan, while officiating as a priest in the Temple, there slew his brother Jeshua in anger, the author states as his view of the crime that "neither among Greeks nor barbarians had so savage and impious a deed ever been committed." "The Deity," he adds, "was not indifferent to it, and it was for this reason that the people were made slaves and the temple was defiled by the Persians." When Bagoses, the general of Artaxerxes learned about the incident "he at once set upon the Jews and in anger began to say, 'You have dared to commit murder in your own temple.' " The end of the matter was that Bagoses "made the Jews suffer seven years" for the death of Jeshua. (The translation is that of Ralph Marcus in the Loeb Classical Library edition). This, in the opinion of a Jew who wrote in the first Christian century, appears to have been a logical and appropriate sequel to such a crime. The main features of his account: the murder in the Temple provoked by the victim, the horror engendered by the deed, the consequent punishment borne by the nation and inflicted by the general of a foreign monarch, are strikingly similar to those of the Talmudic legend. And the bearing of the narrative upon the question as to the date of the legend should not be overlooked.

¹⁹ B. Giṭ. 57b top.

²⁰ Perhaps this is a correction based on the feeling that the text in Jer. Ta'an. contained the impossible implication that the hanged men confessed to Nebuzaradan.

²¹ B. Sanh. 96b mid. which agrees in most respects with b. Giṭ. 57b.

²² The material appears again in the Midr. r. to Lam. Introd. 5 (ed. Wilna 2b) and 23 (9a), and 2.2 (44b) and 4.13 (59a); the Midr. r. to Eccles. 3.16 (86b) and 10.4 (120b-121a); and in *Pesiḳta de R. Qahana* (ed. Buber *Midrashim Ketanim*), p. 217f. The legend was very persistent. As late as 1624 a Jewish

The legendary character of this narrative is obvious. The blood that boils for centuries—a spot that will not “out,” the huge numbers of those whose blood was spilt in atonement, the strange role of Nebuzaradan²³ and the anti-climax of his conversion, are among the distinctly legendary elements in the account. As to the origin of the legend it is sufficient, I believe, to point again to the dying words of Zechariah: “The Lord look upon it, and require it.” Some of the details were probably derived from the experiences of the people in the first and second Christian centuries, and we may even regard the legend as an attempt to find some reason for the sufferings of the Jews at that time. The apparent date of the legend would add credence to this suggestion. The Talmudic account is attributed by R. Ḥiyya bar Abin (of the third cent. A. D.) to R. Joshua b. Ḳarḥa (cir. 130–160 A. D.) who said that he had heard the story from an old man from Jerusalem.²⁴ Thus the earliest authority for the legend lived near the beginning of the second Christian century.²⁵ Between his date and the date of the passage in Matthew, which as yet betrays no knowledge of the details of the legend, the bloody persecutions immediately preceding and following the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, as well as the horrors of the reign of Domitian had intervened. It may have been written in the

traveller, Gershon ben Eliezer Halevi (Yiddels) of Prague wrote of it in his *Gelilot Erez Yisrael*, a Judeo-German work containing an account of his travels. In the Hebrew translation of this work, published by J. D. Eisenstein, in his *אוצר מסעות* (New York, 1926) the following sentence appears (p. 181b): ולפני העיר היא ציון בית קבורת מלכי בית דוד ועליהם נבנה בית תפלה של ערביים, ולא רחוק משם אבן אשר נשחטו עליה החינוקות עבור זכריה הנביא ע"ה ודמם היה שותת עד שערי ירושלים. One notes that the error (זכריה הנביא) survived along with the legend.

²³ The legendary words of Nebuzaradan in Jer. 40.2–4 (strange words in the mouth of this Babylonian war-lord) are probably indicative of a tendency, already evident in biblical times, to regard him in a not unfavorable light, or they may themselves be responsible for a later tendency in this direction.

²⁴ B. Giṭ. 57b top.—Jer. Ta'an. IV, 9 (59a) shows that R. Johanan (the third century amora) was likewise acquainted with the legend. But he does not mention his source.

²⁵ The Targum to Lamentations is notably late. Nor are the Midrashim: the *Pesiḳta de R. Ḳahana* and *Midr. r. Lam.*, though they are among the oldest of the Midrashim, older than the Palestinian Talmud. *Midr. r. Eccles.* is relatively late and Jossipon is no earlier than the ninth century.

midst of the persecutions of Hadrian.²⁶ Many were the scenes which might have furnished details for the legend and many the deaths for which an explanation had to be sought.

To us it would, indeed, appear that the punishment was in no way commensurate with the ancient crime. As a matter of fact this disproportion seems to have troubled the rabbinic authorities themselves, and, reversing the usual process, they strove to make the crime fit the punishment. This would account for an addition to the legend which, like the legend itself, appears frequently in rabbinic literature.²⁷ According to this addition, the people of Israel committed not one but, simultaneously, seven sins, when they stoned Zechariah: (1) "they killed a priest, (2) a prophet, (3) a judge; (4) they spilled innocent blood; (5) they polluted the Temple; and (6) it was a Sabbath, and (7) the Day of Atonement." It would account likewise for the comment of the targumist that Zechariah was a *high* priest (a כהנא רבא, not merely a priest as in Chronicles) and was slain on the Day of Atonement. R. Aḥa, the authority for the enumeration of the seven sins, and R. Judan, whose query elicited this statement, were Amoraim of the fourth Christian century. Their date is evidence for the fact that this statement is an addition to

²⁶ Cf., e. g. Graetz, *History of the Jews* II, Philadelphia 1893, pp. 304, 308, 312, 387ff., 421ff. esp. p. 426. (Priests are slain, schools are forbidden, scholars are persecuted, yet there are proselytes.)

[This article was complete as printed when I came upon the exhaustive *Studien über Zacharias-Apokryphen und Zacharias-Legenden* of A. Berendts, Leipzig 1895, which treats the same material—the rabbinic material, however, in a much briefer form. I observe that he reaches a similar conclusion with regard to the date of the rabbinic legend (cf. pp. 59, 61 n. 2, 66). He cites, from ch. 39 of *The Book of the Bee* (see below, n. 34), the following relevant statement which I had not found: *Secundum quosdam sanguis Zachariae, ex quo occisus est, fluebat usque dum Titus, Vespasiani filius, veniret et de Jerusalem 300 myriadas occideret. Tunc demum fluxus sanguinis cessavit* (Berendts, p. 58, n. 1). For this 13th century writer, it was, apparently, not Nebuzaradan but Titus, who figured in the rabbinic legend. The date of the author suggests that this was a later interpretation rather than an early tradition. But as an interpretation it has its merits.]

²⁷ J. Ta'an. IV, 9 (69ab); Midr. r. to Eccles. 3.16 (86b); Lam. r. Introd. 23 (9a).

the legend. The Targum to Lamentations is much later than the talmudic legend.²⁸

The motive for the enumeration of the seven sins and the targumic comment is sufficiently clear. But can we otherwise account for the new details supplied by these additions—the statements, namely, that the stoning took place on a Sabbath which was the Day of Atonement and that Zechariah was the High Priest? The source for the first of these details may be the information contained in the Chronicles account that Zechariah delivered his address, the (immediate?) occasion for his death, before the people who had assembled in the Temple, which suggests that the day was one on which the people were accustomed to congregate there—that is to say, if we may press the point, a Sabbath or a Holy Day.²⁹ Although we have precious little upon which to base such a conclusion it may have been the Yom Ha-kippurim, the old New Year's Day,³⁰ the outstanding Holy Day of the Jewish religious calendar, on which Zechariah the priest addressed his fatal words to the people. We may recall the custom that, on this day only, the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies to atone for the people and the tradition that it was a time of peril for him—a number of High Priests having lost their lives on this occasion.³¹ This association of the High Priest with the Day of Atonement may account for the second new detail supplied by the Targum, viz. that Zechariah was the High Priest.³² It is hard to deny the possibility that Zechariah occupied the position which in pre-Exilic times corresponded to the post-Exilic

²⁸ Cf. above, n. 25.

²⁹ Cf. Bittenwieser, *Prophets of Israel*, Macmillan 1914, p. 172, n.

³⁰ Cf. Morgenstern, "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel" *HUCA* I (1924).

³¹ Lauterbach, "A Significant Controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees," *HUCA* IV (1927) p. 173ff., presents in detail the rabbinic material dealing with this belief; some biblical parallels are cited by Morgenstern, "A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood" (to appear in next volume of *AJS*), also above, "Amos Studies II," pp. 8f., 17. Cf. n. 13, above on Luke 1.

³² Josephus (*Ant.* IX, 8, §§167–169) betrays by no word acquaintance with the rabbinic legend. His use of the title ἀρχιερεύς in referring to Jehoiada is merely in keeping with his style and has no further significance.

office of High Priest.³³ But the fact remains that these details, whatever basis they may or may not have in fact, are only later embellishments of the legend, intended to indicate the heinous character of the offense.

A final detail concerns the exact spot where it was supposed that Zechariah died. There is quite a bit of material available as to this point. It will be remembered that in both Luke and Matthew an attempt is made to define the position more precisely. Luke locates the spot "between the altar and the house" (μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου), Matthew "between the shrine and the altar" (μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου).³⁴

³³ Cf. Morgenstern, "A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood," *AJSL*.

³⁴ Cf. Epiphanius (Schermann, p. 106; cf. above n. 13): A: ἐρχόμενα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου κυρίου; B (=Dorotheus) and D: ἐρχόμενα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου and later ἀνὰ μέσον ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλλάμ (=Αἰλάμ [D] Hebr. שִׁילָם cf. Schermann, p. 107); C (=cod. August. in Migne): μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (Schermann, p. 71); Sb (=Salomon of Basrah, *The Book of the Bee* early 13th cent.): inter gradus altaris interfecit et sanguinem eius ad cornua altaris sparsit. The author of the version in the cod. August. seems to have substituted the phrase in Matth. 23.35 for the earlier reading, that of Dorotheus and D. This lends support to the opinion that this writer was influenced by the erroneous gloss in Matthew. The phrase ἐρχόμενα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου agrees completely with the position of Zechariah in the talmudic legend (see below p. 345) and may even betray the author's acquaintance with it.

Does it suggest that Zechariah had sought sanctuary by taking hold of the horns of the altar? I am indebted to Prof. Carl H. Kraeling for the suggestion, made to me orally, that the subject of the fourth episode of "The Ezekiel Panel" of Register C among the wall-paintings in the Dura Synagogue is the death of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. He has kindly supplied me with an excellent photograph of the scene in question. His own description of the scene and the problems concerning it can be read in the *Preliminary Report on the Synagogue at Dura*, Yale University Press, 1936, p. 50f. Against this identification is the fact that the picture is that of *one man beheading another* whereas the biblical account of the death of Zechariah in 2 Chr. 24 tells that he was *stoned* by the *people*. Most of the proposed identifications suffer from the difficulty encountered in discovering a connection between the supposed subject and Ezekiel, with whom the remainder of the panel is concerned. Our study, as it seems to me, adds probability to Prof. Kraeling's suggestion. The number and variety of the references to the death of this Zechariah in rabbinic and Christian literature is evidence that the theme was a popular one at the time the paintings were executed—the middle of the third Christian century

The two phrases are actually identical: *oĩkos* in Luke and *vaos* in Matthew both refer to the Temple proper, the Mishnaic *היכל*. Accordingly, in the first Christian century it was believed that the priest was slain between the altar and the *היכל*. This marks an advance over the Chronicles account which says merely that

(cf. *op. cit.*, p. 86)—and it would be strange, perhaps, if we did not find some historical allusion to it here. It is notable, moreover, that, in all of the literary material on this Zechariah, almost the only place where death by stoning is mentioned is the passage in Second Chronicles. This detail in the original seems to have been neglected in later tradition where the emphasis was upon the blood that had been spilt. The altar, likewise, became an important detail in later allusions to the event even as it is in the painting. It was also forgotten in some of the versions of the legend (Epiphanius, Sozomenus and the rabbinic sources mentioned in n. 15) that Joash only ordered the death of Zechariah and did not himself put the priest to death. The pilgrim from Bordeaux thought that he had been slain by soldiers. (The disassociation of the legend from the details of the Chronicles account was no doubt expedited by the fact that confusion was increasing in the minds of the people as to which Zechariah it was who met his end in the Temple. If it was thought to be the prophet Zechariah the account in Chronicles could, of course, be disregarded.) The painting, if its theme is, indeed, the death of Zechariah, probably pictures, first a soldier of Joash removing him from the altar where he has sought sanctuary, and then the king himself (?) beheading Zechariah with his soldiers looking on. That the man with the raised sword could be a king appears correct if one compares his clothes with those of Ahasuerus in the Esther panel and of Pharaoh in the "Infancy of Moses" panel. As to the connection between this scene and Ezekiel, we recall that the one rabbinic sequel to the slaying of Zechariah has as its setting the devastation of Jerusalem by Nebuzaradan, an event which happened during the life-time of Ezekiel, and which he emphatically anticipated. Was this scene depicted along with the others intended for the edification of the worshippers in order to remind them of an inherited guilt for which the loss of the Temple was thought to be an atonement? In following this suggestion of Prof. Kraeling we have due regard for the principle expressed by him (*op. cit.*, p. 65 and *passim*) that the Jewish *haggadah* must be given consideration in any attempt to interpret the paintings since details of the biblical accounts underwent many changes in rabbinic literature. Cf. also du Mesnil, "Les Peintures de la Synagogue de Doura-Europos" *Rev. Bibl.*, XLIII (1934), p. 117i.—In fairness to du Mesnil's proposal that the person executed in this scene is Ezekiel, it should be noted that Origenes wrote: Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Isaiam et Zachariam occisum et Ezechielem (quoted by Berendts, p. 26 [cf. above n. 26] from *Matthaeum Commentariorum series*, ed. de la Rue, Vol. III, p. 848, col. 2, d).—Sukenik (*Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Syria*, London 1934, p. 85) implies that the whole panel concerns not Ezekiel but Zechariah.

he was stoned "in the court of the house of the Lord"—'בִּחְצֵר בֵּית י' (v. 21). There were several courts in the Temple compound before the Temple proper, and the New Testament passages, with their mention of the altar, obviously mean to choose among them—their choice falling upon the innermost court, the one which contained the altar. A person approaching from the East would pass in order through the court of the Gentiles, the court of the women, the court of the ordinary Israelites, the court of the priests, would pass the sacrificial altar in this court and, beyond it, the spot where, according to this opinion, Zechariah was slain, would then ascend the steps of the Temple proper, would pass through the porch of this structure into the room called the Holy and stand before the innermost room, the Holy of Holies which only the High Priest might enter once a year.

The Talmud agrees with the New Testament in its choice of the court intended in the passage in Chronicles. In another addition to the legend similar in character to the one which enumerates the seven sins and ascribed to the same R. Aḥa, in answer to the question: "Where did they kill Zechariah? In the court of the women or in the court of the ordinary Israelites?" this rabbinical authority replied: "In neither of these but in the court of the priests—בְּעִזְרַת הַכֹּהֲנִים."³⁵ The legend itself obviously had the same court in mind. The boiling blood in the legend was near enough to the altar for the people to explain it plausibly as blood from their sacrifices on the altar. And Nebuzaradan was able, according to one version of the legend, to compare the appearance of the blood of his sacrifices with that of the slain priest.

Why did the earliest of these post-biblical references, the one in the New Testament, attempt to specify the exact spot where Zechariah died—thus adding a thought which is totally irrelevant in its context? And from what source does this detail come? Is it derived from the statement in Chronicles, that when delivering his address Zechariah "stood above the people—מַעַל לָעָם" (v. 20)?³⁶ And does, it, therefore, locate him at this moment on the

³⁵ Jer. Ta'an. IV, 9 (69a); repeated in Lam. r. Introd. 23 (9a); Eccles. r. to 3.16 (86b).

³⁶ Cf. 2 Ki. 11.14: הַמֶּלֶךְ עֹמֵד עַל הָעֲמֹד כַּשְּׁפַט.—No great distance separated the altar from the entrance to the Temple proper; according to Mish. Mid. 5.1,

twelve steps at the entrance to the shrine?³⁷ Or is the background of this location some thought that Zechariah was about to enter the shrine? Does it intend that he was on his way to the Holy of Holies? And is this again a vague allusion to the Yom Kippur ritual? If so—but this is a large “if”—later tradition may have interpreted the biblical incident as another instance of a High Priest who lost his life in connection with the ceremony on the Day of Atonement.

Legends are to only a very limited extent recollections. For the most part they are accretions. Succeeding generations do not more accurately recall events of the distant past—they embellish these events with new inventions. There is nothing in the rabbinic account of the death of Zechariah the priest which can not be regarded as an accretion of this sort.

twenty-two ells, something over forty feet. See also the “Plan of the Temple according to the Talmud” by J. D. Eisenstein, reproduced in *JE*, XII, p. 95.

³⁷ The rabbinic legend certainly places him nearer the altar than the entrance to the shrine; see above, p. 345.

THE CUSTOM OF LOOKING AT THE FINGERNAILS AT THE OUTGOING OF THE SABBATH*

SOL FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

IT HAS long been a custom among Jews for people to look at the reflection of the habdalah¹ light in their nails when they say the blessing over the light at the outgoing of the Sabbath.² Though the practice is generally assumed to be implied in the Mishnah,³ no reference to it is to be found in the Talmud.⁴

* Dedicated to my friend and colleague, Dr. Jacob Z. Lauterbach.

¹ Habdalah, unless more rigidly defined, means the whole complex of ceremonies and customs which serve to indicate the separating of the Sabbath from the secular part of the week.

² See Šulḥan 'Aruk, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 298, 3; *Seder 'Abodat Yisrael* ed. S. Baer (Rödelheim 1868) p. 312.

³ Ber. VIII, 6 לאורו על הנר עד שיאחזו לאורו. See below pp. 351 and 355.

⁴ Abraham ben Nathan (ibn Yarḥi, c. 1150) in his *Hamanhig* (Berlin 1855) p. 34b, section 68 traces the custom to the Palestinian Talmud: ירושלמי פרק כיצד מברכין מאמתי מברכין על האור משיכיר בין צפורן לבשר והוה בשיטת פרקי ר' אליעזר ומסחכל בצפורניו שהן לבנות מן הנוף. The passage cannot be found in our Yerushalmi, neither in chapter VI, where ibn Yarḥi puts it, nor in chapter VIII, where one would normally expect it. See Ratner ציון ירושלים vol. I (Vilna 1901) p. 189; ירושלים ed. Lunz, vol. VII (1906), pp. 160, 238–239. It is of course not unusual for statements which never were in the Palestinian Talmud to be headed ירושלמי. The word is often used for מדרש and quite appropriately because most of the Midrashim originated in Palestine. See Lunz, *op. cit.*, pp. 149–150. What is strange about Hamanhig's statement, however, is that it actually refers to chapter VI of Berakot מברכין. פרק כיצד מברכין. My notion of what has happened is this: In chapter XX of Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer, where nails are for the first time referred to, the first words of Mani's statement are כיצד חייב אדם לברך. This could easily have been taken for כיצד מברכין, or there may even have been a reading כיצד מברכין. And since it came from the Midrash Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer it was referred to as ירושלמי. Later on, when ירושלמי was taken to mean the Palestinian Talmud, the word פרק could very naturally have been inserted. This is a very tenuous theory, but we must remember that here it is necessary to explain not only how it is that ירושלמי is used when no reference to the Palestinian Talmud was intended — which is simple — but also how כיצד מברכין arose — which is not so simple.

The earliest recorded reference to the custom is found in *Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer*⁵ and is ascribed to Rabbi Mani,⁶ a Palestinian teacher of the fourth century.⁷ His statement runs:⁸

כיצד חייב אדם לברך על כוס של יין לאור האש ואומר ברוך מאורי האש וכשמחזיר ידיו מן האש אומר המבדיל בין קדש לחול. ואם אין לו יין פושט את ידיו לאור האש ומסתכל בצפרניו שהן לבנות מן הגוף ואומר ברוך מאורי האש וכיון שמרחיק ידו מן האש אומר ברוך המבדיל בין קדש לחול. ואם אין לו אש פושט ידו לאור הכוכבים שהן של אש ומסתכל בצפרניו שהם לבנות מן הגוף ואומר ברוך מאורי האש. ואם נתקדרו שמים תולש אבן מן הארץ ומבדיל בין קדש לחול. ואומר ברוך המבדיל בין קדש לחול.

"How must a man say the habdalah blessing? Over a cup of wine at the light of a fire. And he says: 'Blessed art Thou who createst the lights of fire.' When he removes his hands from the fire he says: 'who dividest the holy from the profane.'

"If he has no wine he stretches his hands towards the light of a fire and looks at his nails which are whiter than his body and says: 'Blessed art Thou who createst the lights of fire.' And when he removes his hand from the fire he says: 'Blessed art Thou who dividest the holy from the profane.'

"If he has no fire he stretches his hands towards the light

⁵ Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (second edition with additions by Brüll, Frankfurt a. M. 1892, p. 289 and note a) believes that the book was written no earlier than at the beginning of the eighth century (or according to Brüll's insertion in note a the last third of the seventh century). Brüll also believes that it was done no later than the second half of the eighth century. Zunz believes (p. 290 and note b) that the book is first mentioned by R. Nissim (c. 1030). But it is already mentioned by Naṭronai (died c. 857) quoted in Seder R. Amram (died c. 875). See below p. 350. Friedlander in his translation of *Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer* (London, 1916) puts its final redaction in the second or third decade of the ninth century (p. liii). But see the references he gives on p. liv and lv.

⁶ The name also occurs as מנא, מנא. It is an abbreviation of מנחם. See Bacher, *Die Agada der Palästinenischen Amoräer* vol. III (Strassburg 1899), p. 443, note 4.

⁷ See Bacher *op. cit.* p. 457.

⁸ We quote from the Warsaw edition of 1852, with notes by David Luria. The best manuscript seems to be the one on which Friedlander based his translation (see Friedlander, *op. cit.*, p. xiv) but it has not been published. We refer to Luria's text because it is as good as any of the prints and also because it has elaborate and penetrating notes.

of the stars, which are of fire, and looks at his nails which are whiter than his body and says: 'Blessed art Thou who createst the lights of fire.'

"If the sky is dark he tears a stone from the ground and performs the habdalah ceremony that way and says: 'Blessed art Thou who dividest the holy from the profane.' "

The most essential element in the ceremony as it is here described is light. The cup of wine too is important, for when one has it one need not look at the nails at all.⁹ But the cup of wine is not indispensable.¹⁰ And the importance of looking at the nails can be gauged if we notice that it is sufficient merely to look at the reflection of light in them, no matter if the light is as pale as starlight.¹¹ It is only when there is no light at all that the use of the nails is omitted. But we are given no idea of the motive for their being used.¹²

The next¹³ reference to the custom is found in Midrash Tehillim on Psalm 35.¹⁴ It reads simply: **הצפרנים בהם להסתכל** "the nails: in them to look at light for habdalah."¹⁵

⁹ This differs from the later practice in which one uses both wine and the nails.

¹⁰ In the later practice it is indispensable.

¹¹ In the later practice one must use light or omit the habdalah.

¹² Some authorities take the phrase **שהן לבנות מן הנוף** to be the reason for using the nails and paraphrase it by **לפי שהן לבנות מן הנוף**. See p. 358. But this is hardly so; the phrase here seems to be no more than descriptive.

¹³ Putting the quotation from Midrash Tehillim after the one from Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer is arbitrary, for the two books cannot be dated with any exactness. Still it is possible to date Mani, the author of the statement in Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer, with some assurance, while the statement in Midrash Tehillim is given anonymously and can not be dated. For the date of Midrash Tehillim see Zunz, *op. cit.*, p. 279. He puts its composition in the last centuries of the Gaonic period, though much of its material is much older. See also Zunz, *op. cit.*, 361, 375.

¹⁴ Buber's edition of Midrash Tehillim (Vilna 1891), p. 248.

¹⁵ The translation is clumsy but the Hebrew also is poor; it does not seem to hang together. In Yalkuṭ to Psalms (vol. II, Vilna 1908 p. 908a, section 723 the comment on the nails reads **מליקת או פריעה בהם לעשות** **העוף או שניהם יחד** **ובוחן להסתכל** **אור להבדלה**. This passage has the added difficulty of the phrase **בוחן**, thumb, is usually corrected to **בון**, with them. See Lewin, *Ozar Hageonim*, vol. I (Haifa 1928), p. 124 note 7. That does not make the reading any smoother. I get the impression that this

Naṭronai Gaon (died c. 857) is quoted as follows in the Seder of R. Amram (died c. 875):¹⁶ והכי אמר רב נטרנאי ראש ישיבה במוצאי שבת בבורא מאורי האש כך עושין בשתי ישיבות שמביטין בכפות ידם וכך ראינו רבותינו ז"ל שהיו [עושין] ואומרים [נביט] בידנו כדי שנהנה מן האור כדרך ששנינו אין מברכין על האור עד שיאותו לאורו וכך מנהג. וראינו ששנה בפרקי ר' אליעזר בן הורקנוס שמצוה להסתכל בצפרניו מיהו אין רגילין בכך. "And thus did R. Naṭronai head of the academy"¹⁷ say: At the outgoing of the Sabbath in the blessing 'who createst the lights of fire' they do as follows in the two academies¹⁸ — they look at the palms of their hands. And thus have we seen our masters of blessed memory do and say: 'Let us look at our hands in order to benefit from the light, in accordance with the Mishnah passage'¹⁹ "one doesn't say a blessing over the light"²⁰ until one has benefited from its light." ' And that is the custom.

"And we have seen that it is taught in Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli'ezer ben Horkenos that it is a duty to look at one's nails. But scholars²¹ are not in the habit of doing that."

Even a superficial consideration of this passage shows that the attitude towards the use of the palms is different from the attitude towards the use of the nails. Indeed there is a sharp contrast between them. Here we cannot say that those who are not in the habit of using the nails do not know of the practice.

reading of the Yalkuṭ means to assign one set of functions to the nails and another function to the thumb, and that the reading בָּהֶן is correct. The thumb may have played some role in the haddalah (see below p. 364 and the references there). The editio princeps of the Yalkuṭ (Salonica 1521–1527) vol. III, page 21c reads: צפרנים לעשות בהם ובהן להסתכל אור להבדלה. This makes no sense at all, for the object of לעשות has fallen out. But that בהם could be followed by בהן may show that the two are not the same thing and that the second one must have meant thumb.

¹⁶ *Seder Rab Amram*, ed. Coronel (Warsaw 1865), p. 32a. *Seder Amram Hašalem*, ed. Frumkin (Jerusalem 1912) vol. II, p. 59a. See Lewin, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 124 and the references there.

¹⁷ At Sura.

¹⁸ Sura and Pumbedita.

¹⁹ Ber. VIII, 6. See b. Ber. 53b top, and p. Ber. VIII, 6 (12c top).

²⁰ However it makes better sense to read the first as אור, fire. That makes it an exact parallel to the original Mishnah passage which has נר.

²¹ The more enlightened people.

Not only do they know of it, but it is even held that Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli'ezer regarded it as a *miṣwah*, a religious duty. Actually Mani's statement says nothing that strong.²² Now if those who do not follow the custom still feel that it is a *miṣwah*, it must have played a considerable role with the people. Further, since it is the *ḥakamim* who do not make a habit of using the nails, we may deduce that it is the popular custom to do so, while it is the more enlightened who reject it. What can be the motive for this? Offhand one can see no good reason why it should be more objectionable to use the nails than to use the palm. The reason certainly cannot be that Mishnah Berakot VIII, 6 implies the latter, as is suggested by Naṭronai, and not the former. For the latter also is not mentioned or suggested in the Mishnah, and the Talmudim commenting on the Mishnah mention neither.²³ In so far as the Talmudic material does suggest anything that is not patent it suggests the use of the nails rather than of the palm.²⁴ There must be some good reason why one is preferable to the other. And to say that Naṭronai is describing what was prevalent only in Sura and Pumbedita still does not explain the prevalence.

From the statement of Simeon Ḳayyara (c. 825), the reputed author of the Halakot Gedolot, who probably lived at Sura²⁵ and was a contemporary of Naṭronai we get the impression that it really was the custom not to look at the nails in Sura. For he does not even mention them. Halakot Gedolot has the following:²⁶ אמר רב יהודה אמר רב אין מחזירין על האור כדרך שמחזירין על המצות ואין מברכין על האור עד שיאותו לאורו ומשום הכי פשטין ידים בהבדלה מיחוי אי איכא נהורא אי לא דכיון דלאו בורא האש קא מברכין אלא בורא מאורי האש אי איכא נהורא אין ואי לא לא ואי חזי במידי אחרינא או בחבריה שפיר דאמי. "Said R. Jehudah said Rab: 'One does not go around looking for fire as one does in order to fulfill the other commandments.' And one does not say the blessing over fire

²² See p. 348.

²³ Ber. 53b top; p. Ber VIII, 6 (12c top).

²⁴ See below p. 355.

²⁵ Schloesinger in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, p. 461a.

²⁶ The edition of Hildesheimer (Berlin 1888) p. 47. With a few minor variations, p. 14a of the Vienna (1810) edition.

unless one has benefited by its light.²⁷ And for this reason do we stretch out the hands at the habdalah, to see if there is light or not. For since the blessing that we say is not 'who createst fire,' but 'who createst the lights of fire,' if there is light one says the blessing, and if there is not one does not. However if one sees something else or someone else it is all right."²⁸

For the Talmudic material on the Mishnah statement, in Ber. 53b, which Ḳayyara had available, he substitutes the material on stretching out the hands. And in addition he links the practice up directly with the prescription of the Mishnah. Further Ḳayyara himself does not consider the practice indispensable for he concludes by stating that if one sees something other than his hand or another person that is sufficient and it is not necessary to look at the hand. It must then have been a common custom in his time. But it is different with the nails. Since Naṭronai mentions them and since Ḳayyara was his contemporary and probably lived at the same place, it is unlikely that Ḳayyara did not know of the practice. It looks as though his failure to mention nails is not accidental. And we can feel justified in concluding that though he does not at all consider looking at the hand objectionable — even though it is not indispensable — he certainly is not in favor of the use of the nails.

Saadia (892–942)²⁹ who was a rationalist can hardly be expected to have taken much stock in looking at the nails. Although we have no complete statement of his, we find:³⁰ ואמר מר רב סעדיה ופושט המברך וכל היושבין ידיהם ונאותין לאור הנר שבירך עליה. "And said Mar Rab Saadia: 'the one who says the blessing and those who are sitting stretch out their hands and benefit from the light of the lamp over which he has made the blessing.' "

²⁷ Ber. 53b; but there the order of the statements is reversed.

²⁸ It is all right to say the blessing without looking at one's hands.

²⁹ 892 is the standard date for his birth. See Malter, *Saadia Gaon, His Life and Works* (Philadelphia 1921) p. 25. Mann, on the basis of a Genizah fragment, dates his birth between the 30th of March and the 8th of April 882 (*JQR.*, NS. XI [1920–21]), pp. 423–4. But contrast Malter, *l. c.*, p. 422.

³⁰ Quoted in Isaac ibn Gayyat (11th century) *שערי שמחה*, מאה שערים, Fuerth (1861–62), *Hilkot Habdalah*, p. 16.

Hai Gaon (939–1038) deals at some length with the *habdalah*. In a responsum attributed to him we read:³¹ *לרב האי ששאלתם על ברכת האור. ברכת האור חובה היא על כל מי שמכיר בין שני דברים שאינן ניכרין. ונהגו הראשונים להביט בשרטוטי ידים עד שיכיר ביניהם מפני שהן מצויות בכל עת ואין ניכרין בלילה אלא על ידי האור. הלכך אין צריך לבקש דבר לידע אם יאותו לאורו שכיון שהביט בשרטוטי כפיו כבר נאות. ושמענו מהזקנים שאומרים שיש בשרטוטי פסת היד סימן ידוע להתברך בו. ועוד מנהגו להביט בצפרנים ואומרים מפני שהן פרות ורבות לעולם הלכך מי שרוצה לצאת ידי חובת ברכה זו צריך שיאות לאור הנר כמו שנהגו הראשונים כדי* “Of Rab Hai: As to your question regarding the blessing over the light. The blessing over the light is obligatory upon any one who is enabled to tell the difference between two things which cannot otherwise be told apart. The early teachers had the custom of looking at the lines of the hand until they could tell them apart — for the lines are always around and can be told apart at night only by light. Therefore it is not necessary to look for anything else to know whether ‘one benefits by the light.’³² For once one has looked at the lines in his palms he has already benefited.³³

“And we have heard from the elders that there is in the line of the palm of the hand a well-known sign through which one can be blessed.

“Further it is our custom to look at the nails. They say it is because they increase and grow constantly.³⁴

“Therefore he who wishes to discharge the obligation of this blessing must benefit from the light as the early teachers were in the habit of doing and thus make himself obligated to pro-

³¹ Quoted from Isaac ibn Gayyat, *l. c.* His version makes the best sense. See also *תשובת הנאותים* (Lyk 1864), p. 20 f.; *שערי חובה* (Leipzig 1858) section 103; Lewin, *l. c.*, p. 126 and notes 25 and 26.

³² Put in quotes because it is verbatim from Mishnah Ber. VIII, 6.

³³ Lewin, *l. c.*, p. 127 and note 1, regards the material from here to the end as an addition of Isaac ibn Gayyat. Even if Lewin is right it just means that ibn Gayyat himself had the attitude towards nails that we are ascribing to Hai. But I doubt that it is by Gayyat; at least the section from *הלכך* on can hardly be an addition by him. For why should ibn Gayyat, who is not opposed to the use of the nails, of himself add the latter part which, to put it mildly, gives preference to the use of the palm.

³⁴ These two sentences may be a continuation of the previous one and all three thus would be assigned to the elders by Hai.

nounce the blessing. Also, the deputy of the congregation who benefits from the light fulfills the obligation for the congregation."

The historical relation and relative importance of the Rišonim and the Zeḡenim who use the palm and of those who use the nails is not clear. But we can be reasonably sure that Hai is dealing with two well established practices. It is true that even though he states definitely that it is proper to follow the Rišonim and look at the lines of the hand he does not state that he is opposed to looking at the nails.³⁵ But his preference certainly is clear. And he has this preference in spite of his knowing that there is a very specific superstition connected with the use of the palms, that of looking for a favorable omen in the lines of the hand. If, in spite of this, he still prefers it to the use of the nails, we may gather that the superstition connected with the nails is worse than that connected with the palm. And that superstition can hardly be involved in the notion that the nails "increase and grow constantly," for if anything that notion is less objectionable than that of looking for omens in the palm. So in spite of Hai's fullness, what the superstition about the nails really is and why it is so objectionable do not appear.

But the motive and the objection do appear very bluntly and without equivocation in a responsum which seems to have originated between 1064 and 1082:³⁶ מצאתי בחשובות קדמונים שחקקתם

³⁵ As the other teachers of Sura — Ḳayyara, Naṭronai, Saadia — are or appear to be. It need not strike us as strange that Hai may here be possibly going counter to what was the common practice at Sura. He often does, but just why we do not know. See Marmorstein, *RĖJ.*, LXXIII (1921), p. 100.

³⁶ Quoted from *Sefer Rabia* (ed. Aptowitz) part II (Jerusalem 1935) pp. 245–6. See Lewin, *l. c.*, p. 125 f., and consult his notes for the variants. I quote only as much of the responsum as Lewin gives, for the other matters in it have nothing to do with habdalah. Lewin regards the *tešubah* as part of a collection that was sent by R. Elijah Hakohen the head of the yeshibah in Jerusalem and his Ab Bet Din Ebyatar to R. Mosheh ben Meshullam of Mayence between 1062 and 1084. See the references he gives (p. 125) and add Schechter *JQR.*, old series XIV (1902), pp. 450–452. Lewin surmises, and rightly so, that extraneous material got into the responsum through someone who either did not know the difference between looking at the palm and at the nails, or did not wish to distinguish between the two. Since Lewin is not

שאנו נחשי נחישות במה שאנו רגילים . . . ושאנו מסתכלין בצפרנים בבורא מאורי האש ומטילין מים על כוס של הבדלה ורוחצים פנינו.

נשיב לכם על ראשון ראשון ועל אחרון אחרון. הנה זה הנחוש טוב הוא ורובו מן יסוד המקרא והאגדות . . .

ומה שאנו מסתכלים בצפורנים זה הדבר שנוי בתל' בבלי ובירוש' אין מברכין על הנר עד שיאותו לאורו ופי' עד שמרגיש בוחק האור של נר הבדלה. "I have found in the responsa of the early teachers: As for your asking³⁷ about our practising³⁸ divination by being in the habit of looking at our nails when we make the blessing 'who createst the lights of fire' and of pouring water in the habdalah cup and washing our faces with it. We will reply in the order you have asked. Behold this divination is good and is for the greater part based on Scripture³⁹ and Aggadot . . ."⁴⁰

interested in maintaining any theory about habdalah he can be relied on in deciding how much of the responsum is genuine and how much spurious. Halberstamm in Kcbak's *Ginze Nistarot* III (1872), p. 5, note 2, assigns the responsum to Joseph Tob Elem (middle of 11th century) in accordance with what he finds in Maḥzor Vitry (see p. 116-117 of the edition of S. Hurwitz, Nürnberg, 1923) and Siddur Rashi. Aptowitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 245, note 4, assigns it to Zemah (c. 890) partly because of the occurrence of the strange expression שחקקם which also occurs in a responsum of Zemah's. This is, to say the least, doubtful. See note 37. I follow Lewin partly because it seems, in spite of Hai's attitude (see p. 353), that to look at the nails was not customary in Babylonia and was rather a Palestinian custom (see Lewin's discussion p. 125).

³⁷ Although I translate שחקקם "as for your asking," the meaning of the word is not at all clear, in spite of the fact that Aptowitzer and Halberstamm (see note 36) prefer it. See Lewin for the other variants. שחקקם is hardly the word to refer to questioners. To me the reading given by Halberstamm (*Ginze Nistarot* III [1872], pp. 4-5) שחקקם ואמרם "as to your laughing and saying that we practice divination" is to be preferred. See Lauterbach "Tashlik," *HUCA*, vol. XI (1936), p. 268 and note 79. שחקקם could easily have been corrupted to a vague שחקקם, especially at a later time when the customs mentioned in the responsum became so much a part of the life of the people that it no longer seemed possible for any one ever to have ridiculed them.

³⁸ Here follow several customs which have nothing to do with habdalah.

³⁹ What biblical or aggadic passages he is referring to is not evident. Can he mean Ezek. 21.26 and p. Ber. VIII, 7, 12c? See *Sefer Rabia* ed. Aptowitzer (Berlin 1913), p. 130 and note 13.

⁴⁰ Here follows a discussion of some of the other customs. Mordecai ben

"As for our looking at the nails, this is taught in the Mishnah in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmud, 'one does not say a blessing over the lamp until one enjoys its light,' which means until one feels the shining light⁴¹ of the habdalah lamp.⁴² And since we have learned so in the Mishnah, this is nothing more than divination connected with a religious act."

Not only are contradictory statements found in this responsum, but contradictory terms as well. It is strange that when the author — or authors — has a perfectly rational reason for using the nails — to feel the light on them — he must tie it up with divination. He begins by admitting that there is divination involved in the use of the nails but maintains that it is a good sort of divination since it has a scriptural and aggadic basis. Having admitted this he goes on to point out that there is a good reason for looking at the nails — and this reason could certainly commend itself to anyone. But he again lapses into the superstitious frame of mind when he makes the statement, one half of which contradicts the other, that, since we have a Mishnaic warrant for the custom, the divination is acceptable because it is a *ניחוש של מצוה*, divination of *mizwah*. Hardly any phrase could so outspokenly blend two contradictory words, *ניחוש* the lower, the superstitious and *מצוה* the higher, the rational. And that the phrase is coined by one person shows how easy it is for one person consciously to carry out an act and be aware of the operation of a higher and a lower motive. That he gives the reply he does when he knows a good reason for the custom — regardless of whether that is the true reason or not — shows how deeply rooted the habit is in the lives of the people who practice it. Even though others may have laughed at it they still practice it.

Now we can see more clearly why many of those who use

Hillel (d. 1298) in his comment at the beginning of Yoma adds *ואף כי זוכרים* ואף על צפרניו של אדם הראשון. For the legends about Adam see Ber. 52b; Pes. 53b; Gen. r. XII, 6; Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer ch. 20.

⁴¹ See Ben Jehudah's *Thesaurus* I, 475a.

⁴² In the version given in *Ginze Nistarot*, l. c., the latter part of the responsum, from *מצוה* to *ומאחר*, is omitted. Apparently for one editor or copyist the contradiction here was too glaring.

the palm do not use the nails. The former merely involves looking for a favorable omen; the latter involves divination. And for some reason, which is far from clear, the latter was to them more objectionable than the former.⁴³

Although the compilations *Sefer Hapardes*, *Sefer Ha'orah*, and *Siddur Rashi* are not by Rashi himself (d. 1105) but by his disciples or school, we can get an idea of his attitude or at least of that of some of his disciples from these compilations. The responsum of Naṭronai appears in one place in the *Pardes* with a few changes.⁴⁴ Naṭronai and the two yeshibas are not mentioned. That is not out of the way for at this late date the responsum probably had a more universal application than it did originally. But in *Pardes* the quotation does not end as it did originally: *מיהו אין רגילין בכך* but *מיהו אין רגילין חכמים בכך*. This shows that the person who altered the text must have wanted to give the impression that it was common not to use the nails — not just the practice of the *hakamim* not to do so, as appears from the original.

The responsum is again quoted in *Pardes*⁴⁵ and this time Naṭronai is mentioned. But there are several significant additions and changes. *וכך מנהג* of the original has been changed to *וכך מנהגי* and with good reason. For in the original no procedure for using the palm was described and *וכך מנהג* referred to the preceding. But here *וכך מנהגי* shows that the author is giving his own procedure and the phrase refers to the following: *תחלה כופף אצבעותיו לתוך כפו ומחשיך תחתיהן ואח"כ פושטן והנה אור במקום חשך ומברך שכבר נאות מן האור*. "At first one bends his fingers into

⁴³ The Rabbis seem to have had less objection to reading omens than to practising divination. See *Hul.* 95b: *אף על פי שאין נחש יש סימן*. Dr. Lauterbach suggests that this is because reading omens is merely interpreting signs which may be given by God, while in practising divination one attempts to get information — from God or other powers — which involves a belief in or a recognition of the other powers.

⁴⁴ *Sefer Hapardes*, ed. Ehrenreich (Budapest, 1924), p. 30; ed. of Warsaw (1870), p. 49a; *Likḳute Hapardes* (Amsterdam 1715), p. 11b-12a.

⁴⁵ Ed. Ehrenreich, p. 26; ed. Warsaw, p. 24a; *Siddur Rashi* (ed. Buber and Freimann, Berlin 1911), p. 262 f.; *Mahzor Vitry* (ed. Hurwitz, Berlin, 1889), p. 117 gives as the reason *לבשר בינם לבשר*. Cf. *Šibbole Haleket* (ed. Buber, Vilna 1886), p. 104.

his palm and makes it dark under them. And then he stretches them out — and behold it is light where it was dark — and makes the blessing, for he has already benefited from the light.” To Naṭronai’s quotation from or reference to *Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli’ezer* there is added *לפי שהן לבנים ובהם נהנה האור בראותם* which appears to be the author’s own reason for the practice found in *Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli’ezer*. But what is more significant is that for the original conclusion *מיהו אין רגילין חכמים בכך*, which gives the impression that people other than the *hakamim* did look at their nails, he substitutes the quotation *ומשום הכי . . . שפיר דמי* from *Halakot Gedolot*, which does not mention nails at all (see p. 351). Thus he as much as says that, though *Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli’ezer* thought that the proper way to enjoy the light is to look at the nails, he thinks that the proper way is to stretch out the hand or to look at something. Now the reason for the insertion of *מן האור . . . החלה* seems clearer. It is to show that the proper procedure is to darken the palm and then let the light shine there — not to look at the nails.⁴⁶

On the other hand Abraham ibn Yarḥi (c. 1150) in his *Hamanhig*⁴⁷ treats the same responsum of Naṭronai differently. He, too, changes the last phrase *מיהו אין רגילין חכמים בכך* but he changes it to *אך רגילין ככך וכך*. This shows that, in his day and place, both practices, that of looking at the palm and at the nails, were in vogue. It is true that he does not say definitely whether he favors the use of the nails or not. But, whereas the original *מיהו אין רגילין חכמים בכך* does contradict the statement of *Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli’ezer*, Yarḥi’s phrase *אך רגילין ככך וכך* does not.⁴⁸ So it becomes clear that ibn Yarḥi substituted for the

⁴⁶ But in *Sefer Ha’orah* (ed. Buber, Lemberg 1905), p. 57f. we find: *ומשום הכי פשטין ידים לאור הנר למיחוי אי איכא נהורא שמצוה להסתכל בצפרנים להשכים ולהבחין בין צפורן לבשר והאורה נראית בהם קודם ומברך*. This is quite different in spirit from what we have been led to believe about the attitude of Rashi and his disciples. Still it is most likely that the former material gives the truer picture. It is likely that to look at the nails is a Palestinian practice, while not to is Babylonian. Rashi most naturally would follow the latter. Cf. his comment to Ta’an. 10a bot., on *תהא לא בעו מים* end: *שכל מנהגינו אחר בני בבל*.

⁴⁷ Ed. Goldberg (Berlin 1855), p. 34 top.

⁴⁸ Of course he may just be saying that in spite of the insistence of *Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli’ezer* on the use of the nails it still is a good custom to use the palm.

original phrase, which was opposed to the practice, his own phrase which is not. We may therefore gather that he is in favor of the practice.

Quite different in spirit from the previous explanations is the one of Meir of Rothenburg (c. 1215–1293) who says:⁴⁹ מה שפושטין האצבעות בברכת מאורי האש כלומר כשהוא כופה אצבעותיו על פס ידו או אין האור שולט בכף ידו וכשהוא פושטן או האור שלט בכפו ונאות. טעם אחר בתחילה כופה אצבעותיו כלומר עד יעתה הייתי כאילו ידיי אסורות שהייתי אסור בעשיית מלאכה ואחרי כן פושטן כלומר מעתה ידיי מותרות במלאכה. "The reason one spreads his fingers out at the blessing over the lights of the fire is this: When he bends his fingers over the palm of his hand the light has no effect over them. When he stretches them out it does and thus he benefits. Another reason: At first he bends his fingers as though to say 'Up to now it was as though my hands were bound for I was restrained from doing work.' And after that he stretches them out as though to say 'from now on my hands are permitted to work'."⁵⁰

The first explanation for stretching out the fingers is practically what we found in Pardes.⁵¹ But the second is a highly rationalized and enlightened one and is far removed from the original crass explanation which took it to be for the purpose of looking for a favorable omen. And it is no wonder that with such an enlightened attitude there is no reference at all to the use of the nails, which is considered the worse of the two superstitions.⁵²

Isaac of Vienna (c. 1200–1270) makes the following statement in his '*Or Zarua*':⁵³ הלכה למעשה שאין מברכין על האור עד שיהנה מאורו ולכך נוהגים להסתכל בצפרנים לאחר שבירך על הבשמים כופה אצבעותיו לתוך פיסת ידו ומסתכל על הצפרנים עד שיבחין בין שחור שבצפורן ובין לבן שבו ומברך בורא מאורי האש. "The procedure to be carried out is not to say the blessing over the light until one has benefited

⁴⁹ שאלות ותשובות מהר"ם, Prag 1608, section תקל"ח. Reprinted with but a few slight verbal changes, Budapest 1895.

⁵⁰ The pun on אסר literally "to tie, bind," then "forbid" and התיר "to stretch out, untie, release," then "permit," cannot be rendered in English.

⁵¹ See p. 357.

⁵² See p. 357, note 43.

⁵³ Edition of Zhitomir (1862) II, p. 48b.

from it and for this reason is it the custom to look at the nails. After one has made the blessing over the spices he bends his fingers into the hollow of his hand and looks at the nails until he can distinguish between the black in the nail and the white in it and he then says the blessing 'who createst the lights of fire'."

With Isaac, looking at the nails in order to benefit from the light has replaced looking at the palm which first appeared in Naṭronai's responsum.⁵⁴ Apparently the odium attached to the nails has disappeared with him. The second part of his statement is much in the manner of that of Pardes,⁵⁵ but with this important difference. Pardes seems to avoid saying that one bends the fingers in order to look at the nails—which is, of course, a most convenient method. Isaac states that one bends the fingers, not, as Pardes takes it, in order to produce a shadow which is then lighted up, but in order to tell the difference between the black and the white of the nail.⁵⁶ It seems that to him the superstition of looking for a favorable omen in the lines of the palm is worse than what might possibly be connected with the nails, particularly since he has a rational reason for looking at the nails. Further, in his procedure, since he does not mention stretching the fingers, the lines of the palm are covered and no light gets at them so that they could be used for any sort of augury.

Asher ben Jehiel (c. 1250–1328) unlike his teacher Meir of Rothenburg does mention the nails. Discussing Ulla's comment on Mishnah Berakot VIII, 6,⁵⁷ which runs כְּדֵי שִׁכִּיר בֵּין מְלוּמָא שֶׁל צְפוּרִי "light enough to tell the difference between a *meluzma*⁵⁸ of Tiberias and a *meluzma* of Sepphoris"

⁵⁴ See p. 350.

⁵⁵ See p. 357.

⁵⁶ Just what he means by the black on the nail is not clear. He may mean the dirty parts of the nail, or he may be trying to differentiate between the white spots on the nails and the parts that are not white.

⁵⁷ Berakot 53b.

⁵⁸ מְלוּמָא seems to mean coin. See Kraus, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter* etc. (Berlin 1898–1899), vol. II, p. 339b. He compares it with *ῥηγμα* and translates it "Gepräge, Münze [?]." See note 60.

he says the following:⁵⁹ **לכך נהגו להסתכל בצפרנים בשעה שמברכין על הנר להראות שיוכל ליהנות ממנו ולהכיר בין מטבע למטבע כמו שמכיר בין צפורן לבשר**. "For this reason do people observe the custom of looking at the nails at the time they make the blessing over the light: to show that one could benefit from the light and could tell the difference between one coin and another just as one tells the difference between nail and flesh."

Apparently what is at the bottom of Asher's statement is the belief that looking at the light in the nails replaces the practice of looking to tell the difference between two coins.⁶⁰

Asher's son Jacob (died before 1340) has little to add to what his predecessors had to say. His material was obtained from Pirḳe de Rabbi Eli'ezer, Naṭronai, Hai, and his father. But he accepts looking at the nails as the common custom for he says simply **ונוהגין להסתכל בצפרנים**.⁶¹

It seems to have remained for David Abudarham (middle of 14th century), who may have been a pupil of Asher's son Jacob, to give an explanation which combines the use of nails and the palm. In commenting on Ber. 53b, as did Asher, he says:⁶² **פירוש בין מטבע של טבריא שהיה מפותח ובין מטבע של צפורי שהי' חלק בלא פתוח ולכך נהגו להסתכל בצפרנים ואח"כ בכף בשעה שמברכין על האור להראות שיוכל ליהנות ממנו ולהכיר בין צפורניו שהן כנגד המטבע החלק להראות כפו שהוא כנגד המטבע שיש בו פתוח**. "This means between a coin of Tiberias which was engraved and between a coin of Sepphoris which was smooth without any engraving. And for this reason do they have the custom of looking at the nails and afterwards at the palm at the time they say the blessing over the light: To show that one could benefit from it and tell the difference between his nails which correspond to the smooth coin and

⁵⁹ Page 70b of the commentaries printed in the back of the Vilna editions of Babli.

⁶⁰ The parallel to Ulla's statement in p. Ber. VIII, 7, 12c reads: **אמר רב: חיננא כדי שיהא יודע להבחין בין מטבע למטבע**. It seems to me that the one common element in looking at coins and in looking at the nails is that one is using shining objects. The practice recommended by Ulla and Ḥinenā may go back to some method of divination in which shining objects are used. See p. 364.

⁶¹ Tur, 'Orah Ḥayyim, 298.

⁶² Ed. Warsaw (1877), p. 102.

between his palm which corresponds to the coin that has the engraving on it."

Caro (1488–1575) in his *Šulḥan 'Aruk*⁶³ incorporates the use of both the nails and the palm and merely says: *נוהגים להסתכל בכפות הידים ובצפרנים*. And finally Isserles (c. 1520–1572) in his gloss to Caro's statement adds: *ויש לראות בצפרני יד ימין ולאחז הכוס ביד שמאל ויש לכפוף האצבעות לתוך היד שאז רואה בצפרני עם הכפות*.⁶⁴ "One should look at the nails of the right hand and hold the cup in the left. One should curve the fingers into the palm of the hand for then he can see the nails and the palm at one glance. One should not look at the inside of the finger tips."⁶⁴ This looks like a compromise in which both the nails and the palm are seen at the same time, while the line in the palm to which there is some objection is covered up.⁶⁵

CONCLUSION

We have traced the history of the custom of looking at one's nails during the *habdalah* ceremony at the outgoing of the Sabbath through a period lasting many centuries. We have found that the attitudes towards the custom vary all along the scale from opposition to acceptance. From some of our evidence it seems that the more enlightened the teachers were the more opposed they were to it. After the varying attitudes expressed themselves during a long period the custom finally found its way into the *Šulḥan 'Aruk* and became a fixed part of the *habdalah*.⁶⁶

We have also found a variety of explanations for the custom — some more enlightened, some less enlightened, some highly rationalized, some starkly crude. It is impossible to decide which

⁶³ 'Orah Ḥayyim 298, 3.

⁶⁴ He refers to Zohar (Amsterdam 1805), *Berešit* vol. I, 20b–21a and *Vayakhel*, vol. II, 208a–b.

⁶⁵ See *Magen Abraham* (Abraham ben Ḥayyim Halevi Gumbiner, 1635–1683) to *Šulḥan 'Aruk* *ad loc.*

⁶⁶ See Kurrein, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. LXX (1926), pp. 46–47.

of the explanations is the more fundamental. But the only one that satisfactorily explains the varying attitudes and the various rationalizations is the one which regards looking at the nails as a means of divination. We know that it has always been common to practice divination by looking at bright and shiny objects.⁶⁷ Further we know that the time at the outgoing of the Sabbath has been and still is considered an appropriate time to ask for a favorable and lucky week.⁶⁸ It is therefore not at all out of place for people to practice some form of divination at the outgoing of the Sabbath.

Who were the objects of this divination? What power or powers was it aimed to effect?

We have very few clues, but what little evidence⁶⁹ there is points to only one answer.

A Baraita found in Sanhedrin 101a reads: שרי שמן ושרי ביצים מותרין לשאול בהן אלא מפני שמכובין oil and eggs because they are unreliable."⁷¹ Rashi commenting on יש מעשה שדים ששואלין על ידי שמן וקרי להן שרי שמן שרי שמן

⁶⁷ See Ezek. 21:26: כי עמד מלך בבל אל אם הדרך בראש שני הדרכים לקסם קסם. קלקל בחצים שאל בהרפים ראה בכבד. See the modern commentaries *ad loc.* One should note that it is the king of Babylon who is represented here as resorting to divination. See p. 351 and notes 36 and 46.

⁶⁸ See, for example, סדר שפה ברורה (Rödelheim 1835), 150b-151a; סדר חפלות ישראל (Krotoschin 1853), 135a-137a; סדר חפלות לכל השנה (Amsterdam 1852), 248-250; סדר עבודת ישראל ed. S. Baer (Rödelheim 1868), 103b ff.

⁶⁹ This material is all given by Daiches in his very stimulating and interesting monograph *Babylonian Oil Magic in the Talmud and in the later Jewish Literature* (Jews' College Publications, No. 5, London 1913), pp. 7, 9, 14, 28-31, 35. He thinks that nail magic may be at the bottom of the custom of looking at the nails (p. 31, note 1).

⁷⁰ The correct reading may be שירי demons. See Rabbinowitz, *Dikduke Soferim* to Sanhedrin, p. 306.

⁷¹ The translation does not represent the text quoted. אלא מפני שמכובין cannot be translated and must be a conflate reading arising from שמכובין and אלא שמכובין; so Rabbinowitz, *l. c.*, note 9. The first reading implies that there is no harm in consulting these spirits because they do not tell the truth anyhow. Hence the author of such a reading is more enlightened and does not take divination seriously. The second reading implies that it is not wrong to practice divination but that one should be careful because of the possibility of being misled. Hence its author takes divination more seriously. Contrast Daiches, *op. cit.*

והיינו שרי בוהן. "There is a practice involving demons in which they are consulted through oil, and they are called spirits of oil — that is, spirits of the thumb."⁷² Rashi again mentions the spirits of the thumb in a comment on a statement of Abaye in Sanhedrin 67b: דקפיד אמנא שר "he who is particular about the instrument he uses is a demon:" שרי בלא כלי "he who cannot do anything without the instrument needed for that thing — for example spirits of the thumb who require a knife with a black handle, and spirits of the cup who require a glass cup."

David Kimḥi (1160—c. 1235) commenting on Ezek. 21.26 where divination is described has the following: וכל זה ממעשה הקסם ופירוש קלקל כמו והוא לא פנים קלקל והוא שמחדדין ומלטשין פני ברזל החץ עד שיהיה בהיר מאד ורואין בו בעלי הקסם כמו שרואים בבוהן היר בצפורן לבהירות הציפורן וכן רואים בסיף וכן במראה וכן רואים בכבד שיש לו בהירות. "All this is part of the work of divination — *kilkel* here meaning the same as it does in Eccl. 10.10 'and he does not sharpen the edge' — and what they do is to sharpen and polish the iron surface of the tip of the arrow until it gets very bright. Diviners look into it just as they look at the thumb of the hand for the sake of the nail, because of the nail's brightness. They also look the same way at a sword, a mirror, and the liver too because it has a shining surface."

One of the late medieval texts published by Daiches is intended for the שרי בהן. In this text the instructions for the diviner are ויסתכל הנער הטב בצפורנו "let the lad look well at his nail." The formula the lad recites is צפורן שרי עליכם "I adjure you, spirits of the nail." And these spirits are instructed שתביאו המלך ממון בצפורן זה "You bring your king Mimon in this nail."⁷³

⁷² See p. 349, note 15.

⁷³ Daiches also gives several texts addressed to שרי כף spirits of the palm (pp. 16, 18, 19, 22) and one addressed to שרי כוס, spirits of the cup. This suggests to me that divination originally was the chief object of most of the methods of performing the haddalah ceremonies as they are first listed in Pirke de Rabbi Eli'ezer (see p. 348): One used the palm or hand in order to divine by the spirits of the palm and hand; the cup in order to divine by the

In all this evidence the nails are connected with other bright and shiny objects and the spirits of nails are connected with the spirits of other shiny objects.

Is it then unwarranted to assume that the divination practiced at the outgoing of the Sabbath by looking at one's nails was intended for the spirits of the nails?

spirits of the cup, and nails in order to divine by the spirits of the nails. It is even possible that the wine which is used served to enable one to get a reflection of the light in it and divine that way. Perhaps the wine replaced oil which was more original but also more objectionable because of its widespread use in Babylonia. See Daiches, *passim*. These are of course only suggestions which need much more investigation.

There are a few passages in the Talmuds which make it appear that the people and authorities had some notions about the looking at shining objects at the outgoing of the Sabbath for the purpose of divination. Those referring to the use of coins (see p. 361) may suggest this. So does Johanan's statement כרי שיהא עינו רואה מה בכוס ומה בקערה (p. Ber. VIII, 7, 12c).

Furthermore it looks as though the observance of the custom of looking at the nails was more in vogue in Palestine than in Babylonia (see p. 348). But that may indicate that the custom was really indigenous to Babylonia (see Daiches, p. 31) and was more widespread there and for that reason had to be opposed all the harder by the teachers. While in Palestine, where it was not indigenous, such opposition was not necessary.

JEÛNE MUSULMAN ET JEÛNE JUIF

GEORGES VAJDA, Ecole Rabbinique, Paris

LES influences juives et chrétiennes sur les jeûnes pratiqués dans l'Islam ont plusieurs fois occupé les orientalistes. Sans vouloir répéter ici une bibliographie qu'on trouvera facilement dans les manuels et l'*Encyclopédie de l'Islam*, signalons seulement les notes précieuses de Goldziher¹ et de Wensinck² se référant à la question.

Un dépouillement systématique des matériaux du *hadîth* relatifs aux Juifs que nous avons tenté, nous a permis de compléter sur quelques points les résultats des recherches antérieures. Aussi nous permettrons—nous de tracer un tableau d'ensemble du problème en nous fondant principalement sur les plus anciens recueils de traditions (les six livres canoniques, de Buḥârî, Muslim, Abû Dâwud, Nasâ'î, Tirmidî, Ibn Mâja et le *Musnad Aḥmed*), le *Muwaṭṭa* de Mâlik, sans négliger les *Tabaqât* d'Ibn Sa'd et le *Tafsîr* de Ṭabarî. Le recueil pratique qu'est le *Muḥ-taṣar Kanz al-'Ummâl*, (imprimé en marge du *Musnad Aḥmed*), ainsi que les commentaires les plus autorisés, tels celui de Qast-alânî sur Buḥârî, de Nawawî sur Muslim et de Zurqânî sur le *Muwaṭṭa* nous ont également fourni mainte donnée utile.

I. De même que le judaïsme, l'Islam admet pleinement la vertu expiatoire du jeûne.³ Selon Ḥuḍayfa, le prophète aurait dit : "l'homme qui se laisse entraîner au péché à cause de sa famille,

¹ "Usages juifs d'après la littérature religieuse des Musulmans," *RÉJ.* XXVIII, 1894, pp. 80-84.

² *Mohammed en de Joden te Medîna*, Leyde, 1908, pp. 120 suivv., 125, 126-130.

³ Une série de traditions là-dessus chez *Nasâ'î* (le Caire 1312) I, 30 suiv., 313 suiv. Quant au judaïsme, il y a lieu de tenir compte de la restriction de Büchler (*Studies in Sin and Atonement*, p. 351) : dans l'esprit des rabbins, c'est toujours

sa fortune et son voisin, voit sa faute expiée par trois moyens: la prière, le jeûne et l'aumône."⁴ Ces paroles ont une ressemblance frappante avec une phrase rabbinique, attestée dans la Genèse-Rabba et ailleurs, et qui a connu une grande fortune dans la liturgie juive du Nouvel-An et du Kippour: "[R. Yûdan au nom de R. Eléazar:] trois choses annulent le jugement (divin): la prière, l'aumône et la pénitence."⁵

Le Coran et le jeûne, lit-on ailleurs, intercèdent pour le croyant et Dieu accueille leur intercession.⁶

Un *ḥadîṭ* très répandu d'Abû Hurayra enseigne qu'à l'entrée du mois de Ramadan le Paradis s'ouvre (*variante*: les portes de la miséricorde s'ouvrent) l'enfer se ferme, les satans sont garrottés.⁷

L'ouverture des portes du ciel ou de la miséricorde est un motif bien connu de la liturgie juive, fondé principalement sur le parallélisme entre le sanctuaire d'ici-bas et le sanctuaire céleste.⁸

Dieu qui accorde le pardon, ce n'est que par concision qu'on parle de l'expiation procurée par le Kippour. Cette remarque, juste dans le fond, n'a qu'une portée théorique: la masse des croyants pense obtenir le pardon à meilleur compte.

⁴ Buḥârî (éd. Krehl), *Ṣawm*, 3 (I, 473); cf. Qaṣṭalânî (éd. Bûlaq, 1304), III, 347-348, où le commentateur essaie de résoudre la contradiction entre ce *ḥadîṭ* et cet autre: "Toute oeuvre pie a vertu expiatrice, sauf le jeûne; le jeûne m'appartient et c'est moi qui le récompense." V. *ibid.* III, 34, 354; I, 480 on a en plus des trois moyens d'expiation "ordonner le bien et empêcher ce qui est réprouvé," phrase musulmane banale qui n'appartient certainement pas au texte primitif.

⁵ Gen. r. éd. Theodor, ch. XLIV, p. 434; v. les parallèles et les variantes dans le commentaire de l'éditeur, p. 434-435.

⁶ *Musnad Aḥm.* II, 174 ('Abdallâh b. 'Amr b. al-'Âṣ).

⁷ *Musnad Aḥm.* II, 230; Buḥ. *Ṣawm*, 5 (I, 474); Muslim (le Caire 1329-1333) III, 121; Tirmidî (Bûlaq, 1292) I, 132; Ibn Mâja, *Sunan* (le Caire 1280) I, 232; Nasâ'î I, 298-300; cf. Qaṣṭal., III, 350-351 qui cite les interprétations des commentateurs sur le sens de l'ouverture du paradis et la fermeture de l'enfer; certains docteurs prennent cela au figuré, puisque le croyant tant qu'il est en vie n'y gagne pas en bonheur. Ces subtilités prouvent que le *ḥadîṭ* n'a pas été compris par les générations postérieures.

⁸ Portes de l'enfer, v. 'Erûb. 19a, cf. Suk. 32b, et plusieurs passages des apocryphes et de *l'Eschatologie samaritaine*, signalés par Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1934, p. 329; au sujet des portes du paradis v. *ibid.*, p. 145. J'ignore, par contre, si les ex-

La croyance à la suspension des peines de l'enfer se retrouve également dans le judaïsme, mais elle s'y réfère au sabbat.⁹

II. Depuis la fixation du calendrier juif, au quatrième siècle, l'observation directe de la lune et les calculs prenant pour base cette observation étaient abolis. Chez les Musulmans le principe de l'observation reste en vigueur.

Un *ḥadîṭ*, abondamment attesté, semble opposer le comput musulman aux autres méthodes de calcul. Ibn 'Omar transmet au nom du prophète: "Nous sommes une communauté d'illettrés [*umma 'ummiyya*] nous n'écrivons, ni ne calculons. Le mois est comme cela et comme cela et comme cela (il montra ses dix doigts trois fois, en recourbant, la troisième fois, le pouce)." ¹⁰

III. Entre judaïsme et Islam, il y a désaccord en ce qui concerne plusieurs modalités du jeûne, désaccord qui s'exprime diversement dans le *ḥadîṭ*. Le Coran (II, 187[183]) permet de manger et de boire toute la nuit, jusqu'à ce que, au crépuscule, on puisse distinguer un fil blanc d'un fil noir. Cette disposition répond à la règle rabbinique (M. Ber. I, 2) selon laquelle on peut réciter le *šema'* du matin à partir du moment où l'on distingue entre le bleu et le blanc.

Mais la tradition musulmane est presque unanime à rejeter cette interprétation et à rapporter le verset à la distinction entre la noirceur de la nuit et la blancheur du jour.¹¹ Ici encore la possibilité d'une tendance antijuive n'est point exclue.

pressions *ša'arê šamayim* et *š. raḥamim* sont attestées dans l'ancienne littérature rabbinique.

⁹ Cette croyance se rencontre aussi dans le *ḥadîṭ*, appliquée naturellement au vendredi, cf. Gazâlî, *Ihyâ*, I, III, ch. 5, § 1 (I, 188) [déjà dans *Qût al-qulûb* I, 96].

¹⁰ Muslim, *l. c.*, p. 124; Buḥârî (Qaṣṭalânî) III, 357 et les chapitres correspondants des autres recueils. Sur le geste exprimant le chiffre (=29) cf. Goldziher, *ZDMG* LXI, 756 suivv.; J. B. Lemoine, *Revue des Études Islamiques*, 1932, p. 1-58; A. Fischer, *Islamica* VI, 1933, 48 suivv. (bibliographie p. 52).

¹¹ Buḥ. *Šawm*, 16(I, 477-478); Musl., *l. c.*, p. 128; Abû Dâwud I, 235; Tirm. II, 161; Tabarî, *Tafsîr*, II, 96-101; cf. Goldziher, *REJ*, *l. c.*, p. 81, qui insiste sur un autre aspect de la question: il est méritoire de manger la nuit du jeûne avant l'aube (cf. Musl., *l. c.*, p. 130-131; Nasâ'î, I, 305).

Pour la rupture du jeûne il y a également désaccord entre les Musulmans et les "gens du Livre." Le *ḥadīṭ* recommande de le rompre aussi vite que possible, dès le coucher du soleil, et l'on fait dire au prophète: "les hommes demeureront dans le bien tant qu'ils hâteront la rupture du jeûne."¹²

Ailleurs¹³ on lit au nom d'Abû Hurayra: "la religion ne cessera pas d'être victorieuse tant que les gens hâteront la rupture du jeûne car les Juifs et les Chrétiens la retardent". On va même jusqu'à faire de cette recommandation un *ḥadīṭ qudsî*, c'est à dire une tradition que Mohammed est censé avoir reçu de Dieu (cf., dans le judaïsme, הלכה למשה מסיני): "Mes serviteurs préférés sont ceux qui hâtent le plus la rupture du jeûne."¹⁴

La rupture du jeûne suspend actuellement toutes les interdictions qui pèsent sur le Musulman pendant la journée. Il n'en était pas ainsi au début de l'Islam, plus exactement au début de la période médinoise de l'activité du prophète. On lit, en effet, dans le Coran (II,187 [183]): "Il vous est permis, dans la nuit du jeûne, d'avoir commerce avec vos femmes; elles sont un vêtement pour vous, et vous un vêtement pour elles; Allâh sait que vous avez trahi vos âmes; il a fait retour sur vous et vous a pardonné. Maintenant ayez des rapports avec elles et réclamez ce que Dieu vous a destiné, mangez et buvez jusqu'à ce que vous puissiez distinguer le fil blanc du fil noir à l'aube" etc.

La tradition n'est pas avare d'explications concernant ce verset.

¹² Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) III, 393 où Qaṣṭalânî citant des textes d'Abû Dâwud et d'autres fait observer que le jeûne des gens du Livre a aussi un terme: le lever des étoiles. Il n'est pas, en soi, réprouvé qu'un Musulman continue à jeûner jusque-là, à condition qu'il ne le fasse pas volontairement. Cette interdiction s'apparente à celle de retarder la prière du soir (*al-maḡrib*) jusqu'au moment où les étoiles paraissent, cf. Goldziher, *l. c.*, p. 84-85, (v. aussi *Qûṭ al-qulûb*, le Caire 1351 [1932] I, 40).

¹³ Abû D. I, 235, cf. *Musnad* A. II, 39; Ibn Mâja I, 267; Goldziher, *l. c.*, p. 81-82.

¹⁴ Tirmidî I, 135 (Abû Hurayra); qualifié de *ḡarīb*. Ailleurs on relève cependant un *ḥadīṭ* relatant que 'Omar et 'Oṭmân attendaient en Ramadan pour faire la prière du *maḡrib* que la nuit fût noire et rompaient le jeûne après cette prière. La transmission de cette tradition est critiquée, car Ḥumayd b. 'Abd al-Raḥmân, le dernier chaînon de l'*isnâd* n'a pas pu être témoin oculaire du fait qu'il rapportait.

Les rapports charnels étaient interdits dans les nuits de jeûne et si après la prière de la *'atama* (qu'on doit dire après le coucher du soleil) quelqu'un s'endormait, il ne pouvait plus manger s'il se réveillait dans la nuit. Mais comme des incidents s'étaient produits (un Musulman, privé de nourriture pendant plus de vingt-quatre heures, se trouva mal le deuxième jour; 'Omar et d'autres transgressèrent l'interdiction des rapports sexuels), Allah révéla le verset précité.¹⁵

Une tradition de Suddî (chez Ṭabarî) dit ceci: le Ramadan était prescrit aux Chrétiens. Il leur était interdit de manger et de boire après avoir dormi, et d'avoir commerce avec leurs femmes pendant le mois de Ramadan. Les Musulmans commencèrent par les imiter, puis à la suite des incidents que l'on connaît, le Coran en disposa autrement.

Un texte d'Abû Dâwud fait dire à Ibn 'Abbâs qu'à l'époque du prophète on regardait comme illicite de prendre de la nourriture ou d'avoir des rapports avec les femmes après la prière *'atama* et l'on jeûnait jusqu'au lendemain soir.

Ce qui ressort avec évidence de ces matériaux, c'est que la suspension du jeûne et des restrictions qu'il impose, accordée par le Coran pour toute la nuit, constitue une innovation et un allègement par rapport aux règles du jeûne suivies par les Juifs et les Chrétiens.

¹⁵ Buḥârî (Qaṣṭalânî) III, 361-362; Abû Dâwud I, 231 suiv.; Ṭabarî, *Tafsîr*, II, 91 suivv. Le nom du Musulman, dont l'infraction a causé la révélation du verset, est transmis avec beaucoup de variantes dont on trouve une bonne partie dans le commentaire de Ṭabarî et le relevé chez Qaṣṭalânî, III, 361. Selon Ibn Sa'd II, 2,102, 'Omar, déjà calife, s'accuse d'avoir transgressé l'interdiction des relations charnelles dans une *journée* de jeûne et c'est 'Alî qui le tire d'embarras. Cette tradition a tout l'air d'avoir été inventée pour la plus grande gloire d'Alî.

Chez Abû Dâwud, I, 237, Abû Hurayra raconte qu'un homme a reçu l'autorisation d'avoir commerce avec sa femme en jeûnant, alors qu'un autre se l'est vu refuser: le premier était un homme âgé, le second un jeune homme. Ce *ḥadîṭ* n'a qu'un intérêt pittoresque, puisque la conversion d'Abû Hurayra a eu lieu à un moment, où la question a dû être réglée depuis longtemps par la révélation que nous connaissons. Pour la chronologie de cette partie de la sourate II, cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, *Geschichte des Korans*, I^e partie, p. 178 suivv.: le morceau serait de l'an 2, mais le verset portant adoucissement des rigueurs du jeûne serait une addition postérieure.

Il est cependant plus difficile de dire si le régime, modifié par le Coran, est d'origine juive ou chrétienne. Le Ramadan n'est pas d'origine juive; il est presque hors de doute que c'est l'adaptation du Carême.¹⁶

Comme dans l'ancienne Eglise en général, et dans les églises orientales en particulier, le jeûne n'était rompu qu'une seule fois par jour dans la soirée, il n'y a aucune difficulté à admettre que la règle musulmane ait été primitivement la même.¹⁷ Mais comme nous le verrons tout à l'heure, l'Islam avait adopté le jeûne juif avant d'emprunter le carême aux Chrétiens. Est-il donc illégitime de présumer que le texte cité d'Abû Dâwud fait allusion à la coutume juive de jeûner depuis la veille au soir jusqu'au lendemain?

Nous ne le pensons pas, pour deux raisons.

L'interdiction de manger après avoir dormi est clairement énoncée dans le Talmud, b.Ta'an., 12a, en bas.

En second lieu, il convient de remarquer que le régime sévère du jeûne, aboli par le Coran, doit nécessairement coïncider avec la période qui ne connaissait pas encore les cinq prières canoniques. Par conséquent, la *'atama*, désignée dans les textes comme limite de la rupture du jeûne, est la troisième prière, celle du soir (dans l'hypothèse, très plausible, qui admet, dans l'Islam primitif, trois prières journalières, empruntées aux Juifs). Dès lors nous rejoignons la pratique juive qui, encore aujourd'hui, fait commencer les jeûnes principaux (Kippour et 9 Ab) la veille au soir, avant l'heure de la prière de *Ma'ariv*.

Quoi qu'il en soit, les différences entre le jeûne musulman et le jeûne judéo-chrétien ressortent assez nettement des matériaux traditionnels: rupture du jeûne dès le coucher du soleil et non après la tombée de la nuit, suspension du régime du jeûne jusqu'à l'aurore dont le lever est établi d'une autre manière que chez les Juifs et enfin, probablement, rejet du comput astro-

¹⁶ Ce qui n'empêche pas qu'en l'instituant Mohammed ait encore été guidé par certaines idées d'origine juive, cf. Goitein, "Zur Entstehung des Ramadans" (*Der Islam* XVIII, 1929, p. 189-195).

¹⁷ Sur le jeûne dans l'ancienne Eglise, v. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, artt. "Abstinence" et "Carême" (t. II, col. 1732 sur la rupture unique du jeûne).

nomique et maintien du calcul empirique de la fin du mois de jeûne.

A ces différences il s'en ajoute d'autres que je me contente de signaler, parce que, autant que je voie, elles ne sont pas senties par la tradition comme altérations voulues de coutumes juives ou chrétiennes.

Si la majorité des traditions désapprouve qu'on se fasse poser des ventouses quand on jeûne, il y en a qui le considèrent permis et Ibn 'Abbâs affirme que le prophète l'a fait tout en jeûnant. On trouve également des traditions favorables à l'emploi du kohl, d'autres qui permettent de vomir pour faciliter la digestion, de se laver, de se rincer la bouche, d'employer le *siwâk* (cure-dents), d'embrasser sa femme.¹⁸

IV. C'est un fait établi depuis longtemps que le jeûne du 10. Muḥarram, dit 'Āšûrâ, n'est autre chose que le Yom-Kippour juif. Il n'en sera pas moins instructif de reprendre en détail l'examen des traditions qui s'y réfèrent.

Pour la commodité de l'exposé je suivrai en gros l'ordre des traditions dans le recueil de Muslim, qui se retrouvent du reste dans presque toutes les collections que j'ai eu l'occasion de dépouiller.

Muslim III, 146 suiv. ('Urwa < 'Ā'îša) : le jeûne de l'Āšûrâ était observé par les qoréichites dans la *jâhiliyya* (paganisme arabe). Lorsque le Ramadan fut prescrit l'Āšûrâ devint facultatif. Certaines versions de ce *ḥadîṭ* ne disent pas que le prophète ait observé ce jeûne, d'autres affirment au contraire que le prophète l'a prescrit jusqu'à l'institution du Ramadan et l'a rendu alors facultatif.¹⁹

¹⁸ V., par ex., Abû Dâwud I, 236-237; Ibn Mâja I, 264-265; Ibn Sa'd I, 2, 170. Mâlik (*ap.* Zurqânî [le Caire 1279] II, 103-104) permet la pose des ventouses à condition qu'elle ne provoque pas une faiblesse de nature à faire rompre le jeûne.

¹⁹ Cf. Buḥ. *Ṣawm*, 1 (I, 473); Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) III, 422 (Qaṣṭ.) signale ce *ḥadîṭ* chez Nasâ'i; Buḥ. *Tafsîr* sur Cor. II, 178 [173] (chez Qaṣṭ. VII, 22-23). Buḥ., *Ḥajj*, 47 (I, 402) ajoute: c'était le jour où l'on mettait la couverture à la Ka'ba. D'après un *ḥadîṭ* d'Ikrîma, cité par Zurqânî, I, 105-106 les Qoréychites s'imposèrent de jeûner en ce jour-là en expiation d'un grand péché qu'ils avaient commis. Ce *ḥadîṭ* a été forgé sans doute en vue de créer un motif au

Un peu plus loin on nous fait cependant entendre un tout autre son de cloche.

Muslim, *ibid.*, p. 149 suiv. Arrivé à Médine, le prophète constate que les Juifs jeûnent le jour de l'Âšûrâ. Interrogés sur le motif du jeûne, ils répondent: "c'est le jour en lequel Dieu donna la victoire sur Pharaon à Moïse et aux enfants d'Israël". Mo-hammed leur réplique: "nous avons plus de droits sur Moïse que vous", et il prescrit de jeûner en ce jour-là.²⁰

P.150 (<Abû Mûsâ al-Aš'arî). L'Âšûrâ était chez les Juifs un jour vénéré, un jour de fête. Le prophète dit; "c'est à vous de jeûner en ce jour."²¹

Selon le même Abû Mûsâ, les Juifs de Haybar faisaient, en ce jour, mettre à leurs femmes leurs plus belles parures.

Le motif indiqué par les Juifs pour la célébration de l'Âšûrâ mérite d'être relevé. Il est sûrement apocryphe, puisque la chronologie biblique ne permet pas de rapprocher le Kippour d'aucun épisode de la sortie d'Egypte. Il s'agit donc d'une invention musulmane nettement tendancieuse, en tant qu'elle ôte à l'Â. son caractère proprement juif et permet ainsi aux Musulmans de l'annexer. Du même ordre est la tradition qui fait sortir Noé de l'arche le jour de l'Âšûrâ, ce qui constitue également une dérogation à la chronologie biblique.²² Remarquons, du reste, que pris en soi, le procédé de grouper le plus grand nombre possible de faits marquants d'histoire ancienne autour d'un jour célèbre dans le présent n'est nullement étranger au judaïsme; c'est même un cliché midrašique assez banal (employé pour le Kippour lui-

prétendu jeûne païen de l'Âšûrâ, mais son auteur a peut-être voulu le rapporter aux violations des mois sacrés qui se produisirent, d'après la tradition, pendant la jeunesse de Mo-hammed. V. encore Abû D. I, 243; Ibn M. I, 271-272.

²⁰ Cf. Buḥ. *Manâqib*, 52 (III, 51-52); Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) III, 422 suivv.; Abû Dâwud I, 243.

²¹ Buḥ., *Manâqib*, 52 (III, 51) a la clause suivante "nous sommes plus dignes de jeûner ce jour-là." Qaṣṭ. (l. c.) dénature le sens de ce *ḥadîṭ*. Du fait que les Juifs considéraient l'Âšûrâ comme 'îd (fête), il conclut que les Juifs n'y jeûnaient pas et c'est pour ne pas faire comme eux que le prophète prescrivit de jeûner. Pure construction de casuiste, fondée sur l'interdiction de jeûner, édictée pour les deux 'îd de l'Islam: *fiṭr* et fête des Sacrifices.

²² V. Ibn Sa'd I, 1, 17; cf. déjà Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed* etc. 2^e éd. p. 37 (en note).

même, pour Rôš-Hasânâh, le 9 Ab, la Pâque etc.) : son emploi en polémique musulmane est une excellente illustration du rôle joué par les convertis juifs et les Musulmans, connaisseurs des traditions des "gens du Livre", dans l'élaboration de la polémique et de l'exégèse.

Une autre façon d'atténuer le caractère juif de l'Âšûrâ était de prêter au prophète l'intention de lui substituer un autre jour. Selon certains *ḥadîṭ* (Muslim, p. 151), le prophète aurait jeûné le 9 Muḥarram, ou tout au moins, il avait l'intention de le faire, mais il mourut avant le retour de la date. Il aurait pris cette décision, lorsqu'il apprit (après neuf ans de séjour à Médine) que l'Âšûrâ était une fête juive (un *ḥadîṭ* dit même, chrétienne)! Le caractère tendancieux de ces traditions saute aux yeux.²³

Le jeûne de l'Âšûrâ n'est pas uniformément apprécié par la tradition musulmane. Nous avons déjà vu qu'il y avait un

²³ V. Abû D. I, 243; Tirmidî I, 145, où Ibn 'Abbâs dit: "jeûnez le neuf et le dix et faites à l'encontre des Juifs." (Cf. encore Goldziher, *l. c.*, p. 82-83) D'après un *ḥadîṭ* d'Ibn Mâja (I, 272), le prophète voulut prendre cette mesure de peur de se tromper sur la date exacte de l'Âšûrâ, donc non pour s'opposer aux Juifs; la coutume de célébrer deux jours de fête au lieu d'un seul, à cause de l'incertitude du calendrier, est connu dans le judaïsme et demeure en vigueur encore aujourd'hui.

En commentant le passage respectif du *Muwatta* (où le jeûne d'Âšûrâ est donné comme facultatif, mais recommandé comme oeuvre pie) Zurqânî (II, 104 suivv.) réunit quelques données intéressantes. Selon Ibn Durayd, 'Âšûrâ n'est pas un mot préislamique, opinion qu'on réfute par le *ḥadîṭ* d'Âiša, signalé ci-dessus. Un autre grammairien (Dahḥâk) sait justifier par des raisons philologiques la fixation de l'Âšûrâ au 9 du mois, en tirant argument de la locution bédouine: *waradat 'al 'ibîl 'iṣṣan* "les chameaux descendirent à l'abreuvoir le neuvième jour" [après avoir bu]. La tendance est manifeste, et l'explication d'un mot d'emprunt par l'arabe est courante en lexicologie. "Iyâḍ et Nawawî rejettent cette explication de même qu'un *ḥadîṭ* d'Ibn 'Abbâs qui veut que le prophète ait jeûné le 9. Cela est faux, disent-ils, car d'après un autre *ḥadîṭ* le prophète est mort avant d'avoir exécuté son projet de jeûner le 9. S'il a voulu agir de la sorte, cela pouvait être pour deux raisons: selon Mâlik, Šâfi'î et Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal le jeûne du 9 et 10 est recommandé pour ne pas ressembler aux Juifs qui célèbrent le 10, selon d'autres pour écarter tout risque d'erreur quant à la date. Zurqânî donne la préférence à la première raison.

Selon Qaṣṭalânî (III, 423 suivv.) qui réunit les opinions des grands docteurs sur le jeûne du 9 et 10 Muḥarram, Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal recommande de jeûner le 9, 10 et 11 et de faire à l'encontre des Juifs.

certain flottement quant à ses origines et ses rapports avec le Ramadan.

Le *ḥadīṭ* note que certains Musulmans ne l'ont pas observé, notamment 'Abdallâh b. 'Omar et 'Abdallâh b. Mas'ūd²⁴; ce dernier, lit-on chez Ibn Sa'd,²⁵ jeûnait peu; en effet, il préférerait la prière au jeûne; or le jeûne l'affaiblissait et il s'en trouvait gêné pour la prière; une autre tradition affirme néanmoins²⁶ qu'il jeûnait lundi et jeudi (v. plus bas).

Les textes portent ici une variante significative: les uns disent: "le prophète a abandonné le jeûne de l'Âṣūrâ" d'autres "le jeûne de l'Âṣūrâ a été abandonné". La première variante semble laisser à la conscience de chaque Musulman de jeûner ou ne pas jeûner en ce jour; le deuxième tend à représenter la coutume comme entièrement désuète.

Selon un *ḥadīṭ* de Jâbir b. Samura,²⁷ le prophète avait insisté, avant la révélation du Ramadan, sur la stricte observation de l'Âṣūrâ; ensuite il cessa. Zuhri²⁸ enseigne que le calife Mu'âwiya a rapporté dans une *ḥuṭba*, prononcée à Médine, que le prophète jeûnait en ce jour, sans y forcer personne.

Nous avons, en outre, des *ḥadīṭ* d'Abû Hurayra²⁹ (ce nom est une garantie très sérieuse d'inauthenticité) qui recommandent de jeûner au mois de Muḥarram pendant lequel l'abstinence est presque aussi méritoire qu'en Ramadan. Une version chez Tirmidî³⁰ ajoute: "parce que dans ce mois il y a un jour en lequel Dieu réadmit certaines gens dans sa grâce et il en fera autant pour d'autres,"³¹ allusion à l'Âṣūrâ, donc à Kippour, à moins qu'on n'ait affaire à une allusion encore plus précise au récit

²⁴ Muslim, *ibid.*, p. 147-148, cf. Qaṣṭ. III, 422; selon Buḥ., *Tafsīr* sur Cor. II, 178 [173], chez Qaṣṭ. VII, 22 suiv; 'Abdallâh b. Mas'ūd mangeait presque ostensiblement ce jour-là et quand quelqu'un lui en fit la remarque, il l'invita à manger avec lui.

²⁵ III, 1, 109.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Muslim, *ibid.*, 149, cf. *Musnad Aḥmed* IV, 78.

²⁸ Muslim, *ibid.*, cf. Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) III, 422.

²⁹ Muslim, *ibid.*, p. 169.

³⁰ I, 143.

³¹ *Fa'innahu ṣaḥru'llâhi fîhi yawmun tâba fîhi 'alâ qawmin wayatûbu 'alâ qawmin 'âḥarîna.*

aggadique, selon lequel le 10 Tišri marque le terme des quarante jours que Moïse employa à obtenir le pardon des Israélites, coupables d'avoir adoré le veau d'or.³²

On cite enfin au nom d'Ibn 'Abbâs une tradition très favorable à l'Âšûrâ:³³ le prophète se serait particulièrement attaché à jeûner en ce jour; d'autres versions ajoutent³⁴ "et au jeûne en ce mois, c'est-à-dire le mois de Ramadan," addition destinée manifestement à affaiblir la portée du *ḥadîṭ* favorable à l'Âšûrâ, puisque d'une part elle constitue stylistiquement une surcharge du texte primitif et que d'autre part elle enfonce des portes ouvertes, le jeûne du mois de Ramadan étant prescrit par la révélation.

La tradition ne se contente pas d'attribuer au jeûne une valeur expiatoire en général; elle cherche à évaluer celle-ci avec une certaine précision. De ce calcul pieux³⁵ on peut tirer, *cum grano salis*, des enseignements intéressant notre sujet.

Le jeûne de l'Âšûrâ, répond le prophète à une question qu'on lui a adressée, expie les péchés de l'année passée, tandis que celui du jour d'Arafa annule les péchés de l'année passée et de celle qui suit.³⁶

Dans ce *ḥadîṭ* surgit un élément nouveau, le jeûne d'Arafa. Ce jeûne pose un problème encore insuffisamment élucidé. Tandis que le pèlerin ne doit pas jeûner à 'Arafa (où se déroule, le 9 Dû-l-ḥijja, l'un des rites essentiels du pèlerinage à la Mecque),

³² Un *ḥadîṭ* enregistré par le *Muḥtaṣar Kanz al-'Ummâl*, III, 360 suiv., énumère les événements suivants comme ayant eu lieu à l'Âšûrâ: arrêt de l'arche de Noé sur le mont Jûdî; pardon de Dieu accordé à Adam et aux gens de la ville de Jonas, ouverture de la mer pour les enfants d'Israël, naissance d'Ibrâhîm et du fils de Maryam. Je ne crois pas que cette liste soit complète; quant au procédé, nous en avons noté plus haut le caractère aggadique.

³³ Muslim, *ibid.*, p. 150.

³⁴ Qaṣṭ., III, 423; Nasâ'î I, 323.

³⁵ Sur l'évaluation numérique des mérites et des démérites v. Goldziher, *RHR.* XVIII, 1901, p. 12-14.

³⁶ Muslim, *ibid.*, p. 168. Le Ramadan, lui, expie tous les péchés antérieurs, Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) I, 123 (Abû Hurayra). La superstition finit par s'emparer de cette idée d'expiation et l'Âšûrâ devient un jour faste pour certaines actions. On lit p. ex. dans le *Muḥt. Kanz*, V, 381: "Quiconque se met de l'antimoine sur les yeux à l'Âšûrâ, ne souffrira jamais plus d'ophtalmie." Il serait curieux de recueillir les témoignages littéraires et oraux de ce genre.

cela est recommandé aux Musulmans qui ne participent pas au pèlerinage. Dans son étude consacrée au pèlerinage à la Mecque, M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes résume clairement les faits, sans proposer une explication complète de la contradiction : " Les auteurs insistent pour déclarer que le jour de 'Arafa n'est pas un jour de jeûne. Comme rien dans le caractère de cette cérémonie ne fait prévoir la privation de nourriture et que les fatigues physiques qu'elle impose sont une indication contraire, il paraît évident qu'il s'agit d'une ancienne coutume suivant laquelle certaines populations jeûnaient le jour de 'Arafa, peut-être sous des influences juives. Des *ḥadîth* montrent avec complaisance le prophète buvant de l'eau et du lait à 'Arafa."³⁷

Je ne saurais davantage résoudre le problème. Il me semble néanmoins qu'en accordant la prééminence au jeûne d' 'Arafa sur celui de l' 'Âşûrâ on a voulu exalter une observance, croyait-on authentiquement arabe, et abaisser d'autant la valeur du jeûne du Muḥarram dont on ne pouvait ignorer l'origine juive. L'hypothèse contraire ne me paraît pas, du reste, moins probable. Pourquoi ne pas rapprocher le jeûne d' 'Arafa antéislamique de l' 'Âşûrâ qoréychite et y voir, par conséquent, une invention musulmane, destinée à faire contre-poids à l' 'Âşûrâ juive? Mais cette supposition demeure gratuite, tant qu'il n'est pas positivement prouvé qu'il n'y eut jamais de jeûne à 'Arafa durant l'époque anté-islamique.

Quelles sont les conclusions que les matériaux examinés permettent de tirer?

Une série de *ḥadîth* procède très radicalement. Elle fait de l' 'Âşûrâ une observance mecquoise antéislamique,³⁸ maintenue jusqu' à la révélation du Ramadan après quoi elle devient facultative ou, selon certains, tombe en désuétude. Ce groupe de *ḥadîth*, dont la valeur historique est nulle, emprunte un air de vraisemblance au fait qu'il existait peut-être un jour d'abstinence à 'Arafa pendant le pèlerinage. L'autre tendance, représentée par

³⁷ *Le Pèlerinage à la Mekke*, p. 253. Cf. sur la question: Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) III, 415-420; Abû D. I, 241, 243; Tirmidî I, 144; Ibn Mâja I, 271. 'Abdallâh b. 'Omar ne l'observait pas, Ibn Sa'd IV, 1, 116.

³⁸ A ce propos cf. déjà Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed*, 1869, III, 54 (fin de la note 1 de la page 53).

des traditions remontant à Ibn 'Abbâs et à Abû Mûsâ al-Aš'arî, reconnaît franchement l'origine juive de la fête (et en ignore la provenance mecquoise). Mais, tout au moins dans les *ḥadîṭ* d'Ibn 'Abbâs, la prise de position du prophète vis-à-vis de l'Âšûrâ est présentée sous un faux jour: dès qu'il prend connaissance du jeûne des Juifs et de son motif, Moḥammed déclare que les Musulmans sont plus qualifiés de commémorer le sauvetage de Moïse et des Israélites que les Juifs eux-mêmes. Cette attitude suppose la rupture avec les Juifs et l'expropriation, au profit d'une imaginaire préhistoire musulmane, des "prophètes" connus de Moḥammed depuis Adam jusqu'à Jésus, attitude impossible lors de l'arrivée de Moḥammed à Médine. Du reste, le motif mis dans la bouche des Juifs (comme cet autre de la sortie de l'arche de Noé) est vraisemblablement une invention musulmane, bien que calquée sur un modèle aggadique courant.

Enfin, une fois admise l'origine juive de l'Âšûrâ, on a essayé d'en atténuer au moins le caractère adventice en prêtant au prophète l'intention d'en déplacer la date.

Malgré toutes ces tentatives, on ne parvint pas à l'éclipser et elle demeure jusqu'à nos jours une fête musulmane respectueusement célébrée.

V. La loi juive interdit de jeûner les samedis et fêtes. La même défense vaut en Islam pour les deux grandes fêtes: la fin du Ramadan (*fiṭr*) et la fête des Sacrifices.

Pour ce qui est du vendredi, il semble qu'anciennement on ne se faisait pas scrupule de le passer en jeûnant.³⁹ Plus tard, cependant, il y a tendance à désapprouver ce jeûne, sans que la défense soit aussi absolue que pour les deux fêtes.⁴⁰

³⁹ Cf. Goldziher, *l. c.*, p. 83-84. Le *Muḥtaṣar Kanz* (III, 363) enregistre les *ḥadîṭ* qui le jugent très méritoire. Des *ḥadîṭ* que je n'ai pas relevés dans les anciens recueils recommandent le jeûne du jeudi, vendredi et samedi, chaque mois (*ibid.* p. 360). Cf. déjà *Qûṭ*. I, 112.

Nous avons peut-être affaire à une influence chrétienne (jeûne continu, observé dans l'ancienne Église le jeudi, vendredi et samedi de la Semaine Sainte (*dies quibus ablati sunt sponsum*)). V. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, t. II, col. 1734.

⁴⁰ Cf. Abû D., I, 241; Ibn Sa'd IV, 1, 61.

Il y a des *ḥadîṭ* qui interdisent le jeûne du samedi. Abû Dawûd⁴¹ en cite trois, mais conteste leur authenticité. Selon Tirmidî⁴² le motif de l'interdiction est qu'il ne faut pas distinguer par un jeûne le jour vénéré des Juifs.

VI. L'ancien Islam connaissait enfin un jeûne dont l'origine juive est manifeste quoique les sources musulmanes ne le mettent jamais en rapport avec le judaïsme: c'est le jeûne du lundi et du jeudi.

Il sera curieux d'analyser les *ḥadîṭ* assez nombreux, qui s'y rapportent.

Interrogé sur le jeûne du lundi, le prophète répondit: "c'est le jour de ma naissance et celui en lequel j'ai reçu la révélation pour la première fois."⁴³

D'après une autre version⁴⁴ on a interrogé le prophète sur le jeûne du lundi et du jeudi, mais Muslim déclare que la mention du jeudi dans ce *ḥadîṭ* est une erreur.⁴⁵

Quoi qu'il en soit de ce *ḥadîṭ*, il y en a d'autres où le jeudi ne se laisse pas éliminer.

Usâma b. Zayd, quoique très âgé, jeûnait le lundi et le jeudi.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² I, 143.

⁴³ Muslim, *l. c.*, p. 168; cf. *Musnad Aḥmed* V, 297, 299; Abû Dâwud, I, 241; Ibn Sa'd I, 1, 62, 129. Un *ḥadîṭ* d'Ibn 'Abbâs multiplie les événements notables de la carrière du prophète, survenus lundi (*Muḥt. Kanz* IV, 238): naissance, mission prophétique, hégire, arrivée à Médine, conquête de la Mecque, révélation de la sourate V, et particulièrement de V, 3 [5], le déplacement de la pierre noire, décès; même tradition déjà *ap. Musnad Aḥmed*, I, 277, sauf conquête de la Mecque et révélation de la sourate V. Le jour de la mort du prophète est le lundi, cf. *Musnad Aḥmed* VI, 45, 110, 118, 13 ('Â'iṣa): *ibid.* IV, 364 un docteur juif du Yémen déclare à Jarîr b. 'Abdallâh que si Moḥammed est prophète il a dû mourir le jour même qui était un lundi. On trouvera les autres références aux textes de la tradition chez Wensinck, *Concordances et Indices* s. v. *Itnâni*. Le fait de fixer au même jour de la semaine la naissance et la mort du prophète relève aussi d'un procédé aggadique, v. E. Mittwoch, *Islamica* II, 397-401. Sur la commémoration liturgique de la naissance du prophète le lundi, v. Goldziher, *WZKM* XV, 1901, p. 46 suivv.

⁴⁴ Celle du Šu'ba.

⁴⁵ (*wa-su'ila 'an yawm 'al-itnayn w-'al-ḥamîs*) *wa-sakatnâ 'an dikri 'l-ḥamîs limâ narâhu wahman.*

Interrogé à ce sujet, il répondit: "les actes des hommes sont présentés [devant Dieu] le lundi et le jeudi."⁴⁶

Abû Hurayra fait remonter cette pratique au prophète qui donne le même motif, en ajoutant: "j'aime que mes actes soient présentés alors que je jeûne."⁴⁷

Du même *hadîth* on possède encore une version plus enjolivée, due également à Abû Hurayra. On demanda au prophète pourquoi il jeûnait lundi et jeudi. En ces jours, répondit-il, Dieu pardonne à tous les Musulmans, sauf à ceux qui sont brouillés avec leur prochain; il ordonne [cependant à l'ange chargé de présenter les actes des hommes]: "laisse-les, en attendant qu'ils se réconcilient."⁴⁸

Selon 'Â'îša, le prophète jeûnait de préférence le lundi et le jeudi.⁴⁹

Si je ne me trompe, on peut encore relever quelques indications concernant la distinction dont jouissaient ces deux jours sous les premières générations islamiques.⁵⁰

'Omar, dit-on, fréquentait la mosquée de Qubâ les lundis et les jeudis. Le prophète avait l'habitude d'y aller samedi.⁵¹

⁴⁶ *Musnad Aḥm.* V, 200, 205, 206, 208 suiv.; Abû D. I, 242; Ibn Sa'd IV, 1, 50.

⁴⁷ Tirmidî I, 144; cf. chez Nasâ'î, I, 322 le même motif pour le jeûne en Ša'bân. Le commentaire de Suyûṭî sur Nasâ'î l. c., citant le cheikh Walî al-dîn, fait remarquer qu'il y a contradiction entre l'idée exprimée dans le deux *Šaḥîḥ*, à savoir que les actes sont présentés chaque jour à Dieu, et celle qui borne cette présentation aux lundis et jeudis. Il trouve, naturellement, moyen de résoudre la difficulté.

⁴⁸ Ibn Mâja I, 272; cf. *Musnad Aḥm.*, II, 239.

⁴⁹ Nasâ'î, I, 306, cf. 322; *Musnad Aḥm.*, VI, 80, 89 (la page entière de N. est un bon spécimen des traditions contradictoires et tendancieuses qu'on attribue à l'épouse favorite du prophète). 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz jeûnait aussi en ces jours: Ibn Sa'd V, 245.

⁵⁰ Sur les croyances musulmanes relatives aux jours fastes et néfastes v. Goldziher "Über Tagewählerei bei den Mohammedanern," *Globus*, LX, 1891, p. 257-259.

⁵¹ Ibn Sa'd, I, 2, 5 suiv. Selon p. 5, l. 24 le prophète s'y rendait chaque samedi; il agissait ainsi, d'après Qaṣṭalânî II, 346, parce que les Musulmans de Qubâ, trop éloignés, ne pouvaient pas venir prier à Médine vendredi. Cette explication est fausse, puisque Ibn 'Omar allait chaque samedi à Qubâ, à pied (Ibn Sa'd, IV, 1, 120 l. 20 suivv.) Il s'agit donc incontestablement d'une oeuvre regardée comme méritoire.

Le prophète aimait à partir en expédition jeudi.⁵²

Le *Muḥtaṣar Kanz al 'Ummâl* relate que le prophète avait l'habitude de prononcer cette prière: "mon Dieu, bénis ma communauté dans les matinées de jeudi."⁵³

'Abdallâh b. Mas'ûd jeûnait lundi et jeudi⁵⁴ (à la même page d'Ibn Sa'd on relève une tradition contradictoire avec celle-ci, v. plus haut). Une autre tradition rapporte qu'il avait l'habitude de relater des *ḥadîṭ* tous les jeudis soirs.⁵⁵

Outre les *ḥadîṭ* cités, il existe un autre groupe, très peu homogène, qui recommande de jeûner non pas chaque lundi et jeudi, mais trois jours dans le mois, lundi, jeudi, lundi, ou jeudi, lundi, jeudi, ou un lundi et deux jeudis.⁵⁶

Dans une bonne partie des *ḥadîṭ* en question, remontant à 'Â'iṣa, Ḥaṣṣa et 'Umm Salama, épouses du prophète, le jeûne part du premier lundi, respectivement jeudi du mois. Je ne signale pas toutes les variantes dont plusieurs ne sont probablement dues qu'au texte fautif de certaines éditions. Qaṣṭalânî⁵⁷ a tenté de mettre un peu d'ordre dans ce fatras; voici son classement:

- a. Trois jours de jeûne, non déterminés, par mois.
- b. 13, 14, 15 (Šâfi'î, Ibn Ḥabîb parmi les Mâlikites, Abû Ḥanîfa, Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal).
- c. 12, 13, 14 (selon Tirmîḏî).
- d. Trois jours au début du mois.
- e. Samedi, dimanche, lundi, au début d'un mois, mardi, mercredi, jeudi, au début du mois suivant.

⁵² Ibn Sa'd II, 1, 121; Buḥ. (Qaṣṭ.) [ancienne édition], V, 131. Cette coutume a-t-elle été pratiquée plus tard? Je l'ignore. Toujours est-il qu'encore au 16^e siècle l'auteur anonyme de l'*Histoire de la Campagne de Soliman contre Vienne en 1529* (texte persan publié par M. F. Tauer, *Archiv Orientalni*, VII, (1935) fait partir l'armée ottomane un lundi, en se référant au *ḥadîṭ* suivant, p. 23 du texte: *kâna rasûlu-'l-lâhi yaḥtâru lil-ḥurûji 'ilâ l-safari yawma 'l-itnayni 'awi 'l-ḥamîs*; je n'ai pas encore retrouvé ce texte dans les recueils anciens, mais il est tout à fait dans la ligne des traditions que nous avons signalées à ce sujet.

⁵³ V, 381.

⁵⁴ Ibn Sa'd III, 1, 109.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁵⁶ Nasâ'î I, 322-323, 328; Abû D. I, 242-243; *Musnad Aḥm.* II, 210; V, 171; VI, 287 (*ter*), 289, 423.

⁵⁷ III, 411.

- f. Mêmes jours à la fin du mois.
- g. Jeudi, lundi, jeudi.
- h. Lundi, jeudi, lundi.
- i. Un jour de jeûne au début de chaque décade.

Bien que systématique, ce classement n'est pas complet. Nous avons signalé des *hadî't* recommandant le jeûne du samedi et il y en a un qui recommande celui du mercredi et du jeudi.⁵⁸

Que faut-il penser de ces textes curieux sur le jeûne du lundi et du jeudi? Est-ce là une pratique proprement musulmane ou, si elle est empruntée ailleurs, quelle en est la source et comment l'Islam l'a-t-il adoptée? Ce qui est certain, c'est que rien ne justifie ce jeûne, ni dans le Coran, ni dans les liturgies les plus importantes de l'Islam, tandis que, dans le judaïsme, il est connu et pratiqué depuis, au moins, le premier siècle de notre ère. Des textes, trop bien connus pour être encore une fois reproduits ici,⁵⁹ il ressort que lundi et jeudi étaient spécialement recommandés au fidèle isolé comme jour de jeûne, or c'est exactement le même caractère qu'on relève dans le *hadî't*. Néanmoins les motifs que la tradition juive indique pour ce jeûne: destruction du Temple, mise en feu des rouleaux de la Loi, blasphème⁶⁰ sont inconnus de la tradition musulmane. Celui qu'elle donne, en revanche, ne se trouve pas, autant que mes connaissances limitées me l'aient permis de voir, dans l'ancienne littérature rabbinique, mais seulement au moyen âge. Dans le *Sefer Hamanhig* d'Ibn Yarhi de Lunel, on lit, en effet, le passage suivant⁶¹: "J'ai trouvé dans le *midraš*:" Cherchez le Seigneur quand il se laisse trouver [invoquez-le quand il est proche] (Isa. 55.6); vous le trouverez proche de vous lundi et jeudi, si vous le cherchez, car le tribunal d'en haut et celui d'en bas sont pareils." Nous avons là l'idée

⁵⁸ Abû D. I, 242; Tirmidî I, 144; cf. *Musnad Ahm.* IV, 78. [V. enc. sur 'Âşûrâ et les différents jours de la semaine ou du mois, propres au jeûne et aux exercices de dévotion: *Qût al-qulûb* I, 93-94].

⁵⁹ V. p. ex. I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*³, 1931, p. 76-77, 524. Notons seulement que le passage relatif, dans la *Megillat Ta'anit*, au jeûne du lundi et du jeudi, est une glose tardive, fondée sur le texte du Talmud, Ta'an. 12a, cf. l'édition de H. Lichtenstein, *HUCA* Vol. VIII-IX, p. 350.

⁶⁰ *על חרבן הבית ועל תורה שנשרפה ועל חרפת (חילול) השם* (Sofrim XXI, 4); cf. Elbogen, *l. c.*

⁶¹ Ed. Goldberg, p. 19b (§ 70).

fréquente de la correspondance entre le monde visible et invisible: comme le tribunal juif, celui du Ciel se réunit les lundis et jeudis. Sans que je puisse indiquer en ce moment la source d'Ibn Yarhi, je crois pouvoir admettre qu'elle est beaucoup plus ancienne que lui; la possibilité chronologique de l'emprunt par l'Islam demeure entière.⁶²

Quant à la série de jeûnes lundi, jeudi, lundi, elle est aussi familière au judaïsme. D'après la Mišna de Ta'anit (I,5), si la pluie ne tombe pas jusqu'au 1er Kislew, le tribunal rabbinique ordonne trois jours de jeûne: selon les commentateurs, lundi, jeûdi, lundi (cf. les remarques du Gemara, b.Ta'an. fol.10a).

Suivant le traité de Sôfrim (XVII, 4, cf. le commentaire de Joël Müller *a.l.*, p.235 et XXI,4), le jeûne de Mardochée et d'Esther avait lieu en Palestine lundi, jeudi, et lundi après Pourim. Ces coutumes sont donc antérieures à l'Islam. On ne peut démontrer la même chose au sujet des jeûnes également célébrés lundi, jeudi et lundi après les fêtes de Pâque et des Tabernacles, car ils ne sont pas, au moins selon Elbogen (*op.cit.*, 124), antérieurs au 13.^e siècle. Quoi qu'il en soit, les textes de Ta'anit et de Sôfrim attestent qu'on connaissait cette séquence bien plus anciennement. Rien n'empêche donc de croire qu'ici encore la piété islamique soit débitrice de la liturgie juive.

CONCLUSION

Le sujet que nous avons étudié dans les pages qui précèdent, est trop limité pour autoriser des conclusions de grande portée concernant les rapports de l'Islam à ses débuts avec le judaïsme. Il sera donc préférable de ne souligner ici qu'un petit nombre de faits, en réservant les conclusions d'ensemble pour une étude de plus grande envergure que nous espérons publier sous peu.

L'idée de la valeur expiatoire du jeûne est commune aux deux religions (tant en général qu'en particulier, pour l'Âșûrâ et l'abstinence du lundi et du jeudi), tandis que l'Islam ignore le

⁶² L'étude récente de M. H. J. Zimmels ("Nachtalmudische Fasttage," *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, 1935, p. 599-614) n'apporte aucun éclaircissement à ce sujet.

jeûne pratiqué en commémoration d'événements funestes ou en raison d'une calamité publique. Le jeûne continu et les veilles, si populaires dans l'Islam, se réclament plutôt du christianisme, comme il a été souvent démontré; aussi n'avons nous pas cru devoir étudier les matériaux du *ḥadîṭ* relatifs à ce sujet.

Quant aux modalités du jeûne nous avons vu qu'elles ont subi des altérations sur beaucoup de points, soit à cause de considérations d'ordre pratique, soit en vertu du principe qui régit les relations de l'Islam avec les autres religions: *ḥâlîfûhum* "ne faites pas comme eux."

Pourtant, même lorsque la religion de Moḥammed se trouve en opposition déclarée avec le judaïsme, elle ne renonce pas à faire usage des méthodes apprises chez les Juifs: des procédés, courants dans l'Aggada, sont mis en oeuvre afin de justifier les prétentions musulmanes.

En somme, l'Islam a beaucoup mieux réussi à appliquer le principe de l'opposition sur le terrain de la pratique que sur celui des idées. Les observances ont pu être modifiées au gré des circonstances et des législateurs; les idées sous-jacentes se conservent, tenaces, dans l'esprit des champions mêmes de la nouvelle foi.

AN ARABIC STORY OF ABRAHAM*

JOSHUA FINKEL, Yeshiva College, New York, N. Y.

A more colorful and elaborate than any other known legend of the patriarch first appeared in a collection of small Midrashim in Constantinople circa 1580.¹ There too in 1718 Eliyyah ha-Kohen re-published from it the מעשה in his *Shebet Musar*. Jellinek, who in 1853 reprinted this story from the latter source in *Bet ha-Midrash* (vol. I, pp. 25–34), claimed that it was a translation from the Arabic (vol. I, p. xvi). Though his grounds for this assertion were demonstrated in 1893 by Grünbaum to be false and inadequate,² the claim itself proved to be a happy guess, for it so happened that the last named investigator discovered fresh evidence pointing not only to an Arabic but to a Moham-medan source.³ Thus אַתָּה מֶן הַכּוּזְבִּים, though not actually found in the Koran, is nevertheless closely related to *ام كنت من الكاذبين* (Sura 27, 27); cf. also Sura 7, 64; 12, 26; 24, 7–8; 26, 186; 28, 38. Nimrod, instead of bearing the usual rabbinic epithet of רשע, is styled in good Moslem fashion כּוּפֵר (= كافر).⁴ Furthermore, contrary to the biblical account, he is not spoken of as the son of Kush (Gen. 10.8), but, in accordance with the majority of Moslem records, as the son of Canaan.⁵ Finally, what more definitely links

*I am greatly indebted to Professor Louis Ginzberg, who suggested to me the publishing of this story, for generously assisting me with helpful advice. His notes signed with the initial [G] very inadequately represent his valuable counsel. I also wish to express my thanks to Professor Marx for pacing the MS. at my disposal.

¹ Porges, *ZfHB*, X, 159, and Ginzberg, *ibid.*, XI, 125.

² *Neue Beiträge zur Semitischen Sagenkunde*, p. 130.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 130–131.

⁴ כּוּפֵר instead of רשע occasionally occurs also in genuinely Hebrew texts; cf. *Bet ha-Midrash* vol. I, p. 130 [G].

⁵ Tabari, *Annales*, I, p. 253: נִמְרֹד בֶן כּוּשׁ; *ibid.*, p. 254: נִמְרֹד בֶן כְּנַעַן. The error probably came about in the following manner: To some scribes copying the pre-Saadyanic Arabic translation of the Bible the second כּוּשׁ of the verses: 'וּבְנֵי כּוּשׁ סֵבֵא וְחִיִּלָּה וְסִבְחָה וְרַעְמָה וְסִבְחָכָא וּבְנֵי רַעְמָה שֵׁבֵא וְרֹדֵן וְכוּשׁ יִלְדּוּ וכו'' (Gen. 10.7–8)

the story to a Mohammedan background, is the fact that ⁶ההיא קרה ושלוח על [עברין] אברהם (p. 34, l. 24) is a literal translation of the Koranic phrase ⁶کنی بردا وسلاما علی ابرهیم (Sura 21, 69).

In vol. V of his *Legends*, Ginzberg added further proof that most conclusively stamped the story as being Arabic in origin. To quote: "In consequence of an inaccurate translation of the Arabic word *Wadi*, which signifies both *brook* and *valley*, the word נהר (*stream*) instead of נחל (*valley*) occurs a few times in the printed text as well as in the manuscript of this legend. This supposition is attested by the words מערה אחד בזה הנהר (27, 1.10), since it is impossible that a cave should be in a river. The legend below speaks of a spring whose water Abraham used; but no mention is made of a stream; comp. also 27, l. 16 שבאת לזה הנהר which is hardly possible, while לזה הנחל would suit admirably" (p. 209, n. 12).

The numerous Arabisms that occur, such as . . . שלום עליך (p. 27, l. 6) and יכל על כל (p. 33, l. 7) and the recurring ועליך השלום etc. also speak in favor of the dependence of the tale upon an Arabic source, but there always lurks the possibility that the expressions in question, having gained gradual admission into Mediaeval Hebrew, came in course of time to be used not only by translators but also by authors. Now linguistic usage at the time might have legitimized a number of Arabisms, but it is inconceivable that it should also have encouraged the spread of Koranic verses in original Hebrew compositions, and of so many in fact as to give a writer an opportunity to parade three of them within the narrow limits of what might be called a *historiette*. The evidence therefore that may be called convincing, in addition to that offered by Ginzberg and Grünbaum, is that ה' הוא האלקים בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת אחד ואין שני ממית ומחיה

must have seemed awkward, and the text probably being without diacritical points, they misread ⁶کنعن for کوس. Cf. a similar error: כוש בן סאם בן נוח. where סאם originated because of the resemblance between ⁶سَام and ⁶حام (Tabari, I, p. 254). Balkhi, *Livre de la Création*, vol. III, p. 47, note 3, (translation) has کنعاشر, نمرود بن کنعاشر thus appearing to be a fusion of ⁶کوشر and ⁶کنعان.

⁶ Read ⁶היא or ⁶היה.

(pp. 30–31) is a biblically adapted rendering of part of Sura 7, 158, and הוא האלקים אחד ואין שני . . . והוא חי ולא ימות לא ינום ולא יישן is nothing but a free translation of part of Sura 2, 256.

On the other hand, it may be argued with a good deal of plausibility that, as far as the last two Koranic quotations are concerned, no Jew could object to their unrestricted appearance in Hebrew garb, containing as they do the genuinely Jewish doctrine of monotheism, couched more or less in a phraseology well known to him from the Bible and later literature. One must also contemplate the possibility that Jews living among Mohammedans picked up certain Koranic phrases and sayings without knowing their origin. However, these objections, though intrinsically valid, may be overridden by the significant fact that these very two quotations as well as the above کنى بردا الخ are also cited in the Moslem versions of the legend of Abraham.⁷ Manifestly this circumstance can admit of only one sound conclusion, viz. that the Hebrew account is based directly on a definite Mohammedan pattern, and was by no means obtained by hearsay from the non-Jewish milieu.

The field of inquiry was enlarged when in 1919–20 Bernard Chapira published in an article of his, *Légendes Bibliques attribuées a Ka'b al-Aḥbar* (*RÉJ*, vol. LXIX, pp. 86–107, and vol. LXX, pp. 37–43), a Genizah leaf entitled קוצת אברהם אבינו ע"ה. The fragment written in the Egyptian vernacular is in consideration of script and paper ascribed by Chapira to the 17th century. Chapira proves beyond doubt that the Genizah leaf represents a fragment of a pretty literal translation of the מעשה אברהם. *פי אלסואק ואלרחאבאת* (*RÉJ*, vol. LXX, p. 38, 1.10) corresponds to בשוקים וברחובות (*Bet ha-Midr.* vol. I, p. 31, 1.9) and ארוחי (*RÉJ*, vol. LXX, p. 37, 1.6) peculiarly betrays the Hebrew original inasmuch as it resulted from the translator's mistaking וְלֵךְ for וְלָךְ (*Bet ha-Midr.* vol. I, p. 30, 1.24).

Further material bearing on the subject is yielded by a MS. recently acquired by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The MS. (125 leaves), the beginning and end of which are missing, is anonymous and undated. Judging from the script and

⁷ Tabari, I, p. 263 and p. 264; Tha'labi, *'Ara'is al-Majalis*, ed. Cairo, 1324, p. 44.

paper, it may belong either to the 17th or 18th century. It comprises the greater part of Pirke Abot, Canticles, Ruth (Hebrew text and Arabic translation), a commentary on the Decalogue, various liturgical pieces, and also several stories. One of these is קוצת אברהם אבינו (59a–80a, large oriental cursive, 17–18 lines to a page, $8 \times 5 \frac{1}{8}$ in., text $6 \frac{5}{8} \times 4$ in.), written in the Egyptian vernacular. When compared with the Genizah leaf, both stories prove identical, the text of the leaf, with the exception of a few minor discrepancies, agreeing exactly with that of 68a, l. 15–69b, l. 8 of the MS. The story not only covers the extant מעשה אברהם, but extends beyond it with several additional episodes. As was to be expected, the part of it preceding and following that of the Chapira text also contains passages pointing to its being a translation of the Hebrew document in question. To quote but a few examples: ומלוו כול אל ארץ וקארו (MS. 5a) and ונמיע אלדי פיה (MS. 10b) are literal translations of the biblical phrases ומלא כל הארץ כבודו (*Bet ha-Midr.* p. 27, l. 19) and וכל אשר בם (p. 30, lines 28–29), respectively. Sometimes the translator merely re-writes the original instead of translating it; cf. יערה ה' אברהם עבדו נאמן ביתו (MS. 7b and Hebr. p. 29, l. 1), and יער ה' (MS. 16b and Hebr. p. 34, l. 11). צלמים (p. 30, l. 13) is translated צולבאן, crosses⁸ (MS. 10a).

To revert to the Hebrew story, is there any work extant in Arabic literature to which we could point as its source? Indeed in the above mentioned article Chapira also published a ten-page Judaeo-Arabic Genizah document written in corrupt classical style, which he considers the original of the מעשה אברהם. After a careful comparison of the Hebrew and Arabic texts one cannot but agree with Chapira that such is undoubtedly the case. While the Hebrew deviates from the original in the frequent change of phraseology, in occasional transposition of clauses and even in the omission of many details, it must be nevertheless regarded as a version of the Arabic (*RĒJ*, vol. LXX, pp. 38–43), for the two texts agree in substance as well as in order of events. The only divergence of consequence is noticeable in the episode

⁸ צלם in Mediaeval literature (as in Yiddish!) stands for the cross of the Christians. It is the only צלם worshipped by the nations among which the Jews lived [G].

relating to Abraham's début as a prophet. At this point in the Hebrew story Abraham meets his father and mother (p. 29, l. 6), while in the Arabic he meets his father and his brother Haran (p. 40, lines 25–26). Since there is further reference to the respective variant in each story, the possibility of a scribal error in the Hebrew or Arabic manuscript is to be excluded. The substituting of the mother for Haran should probably find its explanation in the fact that there exists an old rabbinic legend which represents Haran as rather inclined toward the true religion of God.⁹ Assuming that the translator had this in mind, Haran would go ill with the scene where Abraham is asked by his relatives to denounce God. It is also possible that the Hebrew translator was mindful of the biblical report as to Haran's premature death (Gen. 11.28). Although not thinking it necessarily anachronistic, he preferred, for a display of safer historicity, not to stage a meeting between Haran and Abraham, the Jew, for, in accordance with some views, the latter had recognized his Maker only as late as at the age of 40 or 48.¹⁰ However, he retained Canaan as the father of Nimrod. This is rather surprising indifference to the scriptural statement on the part of a man whom we have just suspected of overdoing a bit the harmonization of the Arabic account with that of the Bible. It is best therefore to think of it as a slip of memory which is quite conceivable in the case of a genealogically unimportant personage like Nimrod. Moreover, the information coming as it did from a work supposedly Jewish, it must have helped delude our translator into thinking that the lineage was biblical. And, of course, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The two Judaeo-Arabic writers must also be held to account on the same ground. While such a general display of ignorance is not easy to comprehend, we must not forget that the table of nations in Gen. 10 is rarely memorized by anyone, and, as it seems, it was not memorized by the original publisher or by Eliyyah ha-Kohen either. Jellinek does not discuss the discrepancy in his introduction to the story; evidently he too failed to notice the error.

⁹ Gen. r. 38, 19, Warsaw ed. [G].

¹⁰ See Gen. r. ed. Theodor, p. 703, note, for the discussion of these views.

In the Arabic original the narrator is Ka'b al-Aḥbar, the well known Moslem convert from Judaism, who flourished in the first half of the seventh century. That he is the sole narrator throughout the story is suggestive of authorship. However, Ka'b is not known to have written any works.¹¹ But even assuming that he had, his authorship, at least of the present legend, is open to suspicion. For Nimrod's boastful conversation concerning his ability to give life and cause death is related by Tha'labi on the authority of "people versed in the lives of the ancients,"¹² and Abraham's declining of Gabriel's offer to save him because of his reliance on God is quoted by the same writer in the name of Mohammed's secretary Ubayy ibn Ka'b,¹³ while our story mentions Ka'b al-Aḥbar in connection with both passages (*RĒJ*, vol. LXX, p. 42 and p. 41).

But in Kisaï's *Vita Prophetarum* too the story of the Abraham-Nimrod conflict is wholly attributed to Ka'b al-Aḥbar. Another instance is the *Leyenda de José*,¹⁴ which is for the most part a literal translation of the Qiṣṣat Yusuf of the 'Ara'is al-Majalis.¹⁵ In this aljamiadic version Ka'b, instead of being referred to only five times as in the original, is seen to be systematically supplanting the other tradionists or else adding the weight of his authority to anonymous reports.¹⁶ How did this quite arbitrary assignment of authorship come about? We notice that in Kisa'i the principal narrators whose names occur repeatedly are three: Ka'b al-Aḥbar, Wahb ibn Munabbih and Ibn 'Abbas, while the others, about eight in all, are mentioned only once and in connection with brief statements at that. Curiously enough the information concerning Musa ibn Manasha ibn Yusuf is ascribed

¹¹ There is not found anywhere a quotation in the form of an excerpt from a book of his, nor is there mentioned anywhere a title of a work of his. In the reference to the "books of Ka'b" by al-Balkhi (*Livre de la Création*, vol. II, Arab. text, p. 42, translation, p. 39) their spurious character is revealed by their being coupled with those of Muqatil (d. 150 A.H.), about whom more hereafter.

¹² 'Ara'is, p. 43.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁴ Guillén Robles, *Legendas de José hijo de Jacob y de Alejandro Magno*, Saragossa, 1888.

¹⁵ *Enc. of Islam*, vol. II, p. 583.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 582-583.

to both Ka'b and Wabb,¹⁷ and in the story of Pharaoh these are joined in a chorus by Ibn 'Abbas.¹⁸ How these three men, cited as independent guarantors, could have couched in identical terms a lengthy story abounding in minute details is puzzling indeed, but the mystery is cleared up by the mention of Muqatil ibn Sulayman, who is quoting the story in their names. The latter though admitted to be possessed of prodigious knowledge and to be a Koranic commentator of first rank, is by the great majority of Moslem authorities branded as an inveterate liar as far as traditions are concerned.¹⁹ Al-Kalbi relates that once he overheard him in a lecture imputing to him a statement which he never made. Upon expressing his surprise to the lecturer, he was obliged with the facetious remark that it was proper for traditions to be adorned with guarantors.²⁰ The following anecdote will even better explain the multiplicity of the *raconteurs* of the Pharaoh story. It is told that once while Muqatil was relating some traditions on the authority of 'Aṭa', he immediately repeated them in the name of Ḍaḥḥak, and then again related the same traditions in the name of 'Amr ibn Shu'ayb. When asked from which of the three he had heard them, he answered: "From all of them," but immediately added: "No, by Allah, I cannot recall from whom I heard them."²¹ While it is true that Muqatil is mentioned only once in the *Vita*, it is quite possible that Kisa'i has for obvious reasons suppressed his name in connection with the other reports and only through oversight failed to omit it in this one instance. Jewish legends were a specialty with Muqatil,²² and many of them emanating from his pen, were undoubtedly accessible to the author of the *Vita*. But even assuming that only the Abraham story was edited by Muqatil, it cannot be said that all the other Ka'b-stories in the *Vita* with which Muqatil's name

¹⁷ Kisa'i, *Vita Prophetarum*, p. 194.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹⁹ 'Asqalani, *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*, vol. X, pp. 279-285; Ibn Khallikan, vol. II, ed. Cairo, 1310, pp. 112-113.

²⁰ *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*, vol. X, pp. 282-283.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 284; Ibn Khallikan, vol. II, p. 113; *Tahdhib al-Kamal* by al-Khazraji, Cairo 1322, p. 331.

is not associated were genuinely Ka'b's. Some of them are found to be ascribed to other traditionists, and, besides, Ka'b who began the study of the Sura of the Baqara in his old age²³ could hardly have adapted the plots of the legends to Koranic situations in masterly fashion. On the contrary, being insufficiently acquainted with the Koran, he is said to have on one occasion uttered a remark which, because of its subversiveness of the teachings of Islam, brought upon him the indignation of Ibn 'Abbas.²⁴ The most plausible explanation that can be offered with regard to Kisa'i's predilection for the names of Ka'b, Wahb and Ibn 'Abbas is that it represented a well-established tendency to reduce the number of traditionists to as few as possible in books intended for popular use, for the masses were not interested in the chain of guarantors but in the story itself. Muqatil must have been an early exponent of this method and, it goes without saying, that many late folk-tales and even individual inventions must have found shelter under its cover. Of course, if traditionists were at all to be cited, no better authorities could be found for the Isra'iliyat than Ka'b, Wahb, and Ibn 'Abbas, whose authoritativeness in the traditions of the Scripturaries was deemed second to none. The same tendency is exemplified in the *Leyenda*. The translator had undoubtedly before him a popularized text of the 'Ara'is.

Now the Jewish editor of the older of the two Genizah documents, from whatever popularized source he may have transliterated the story, certainly entertained no doubt as to who its narrator should be. A Mohammedan theologian of his time might have been skeptical about accrediting it to Ka'b, not so a non-Moslem who was quite unsophisticated about the technique of transmission. Indeed the entire subject of tradition was the branch of Mohammedan science which he knew least and in which he would be least interested. However, a Jewish legend would engage the attention of a Jew, and to him Ka'b, the converted Jew, would appear as the logical narrator. By giving currency to it among his coreligionists, he provided them with a literary production much to their taste. Besides the cultural

²³ Tabari, III, p. 2475.

²⁴ Tabari, I, pp. 62-63.

consideration there was also a political one. It is a sort of composition to which the Jews might well point as a Jewish contribution to Islam in order to raise their prestige in the eyes of their compatriots. Accordingly the editor made no attempt to remove it from its Moslem setting and left all the Koranic references and allusions intact. And although he might have been unaware of some of them, it is hard to believe that he was ignorant of all of them. Provided the story did not offend the religious feelings of the readers, he did not tamper with it. The readers knew that it was Mohammedan and they might well be trusted to take it for what it was worth. The editor might even have known that Canaan was not the father of Nimrod. However, not he but the renegade Ka'b would be to blame for the assertion which at worst could only amuse the public. This reasoning of course cannot be applied to the case of the Hebrew translator. To him the text, if not Jewish in origin, was at least Jewish by adoption. If he substituted **כעב אלחבאר** for **המגיד** in order to completely judaize the story, he could not have knowingly put into the mouth of the Hebrew narrator a gross biblical misstatement to boot. He quoted it unwittingly as he did the Koranic verses.

The story of the MS. of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America offered below, a monument of the colloquial Egyptian of the pre-Napoleonic times, greatly resembles in dialect and orthography the **קוצת אברהם** which Tischendorf brought from Cairo, and of which Jellinek published a specimen in the second volume of the *Bet ha-Midrash* (pp. xxxiii-xxxiv). It continues beyond the Hebrew version with four additional episodes. From this, however, we must not infer that the translator had a longer text before him than the one published in Constantinople. Though it is true that comparison with Mohammedan sources indicates that the Hebrew version does not complete the account, the added incidents are not recorded in any of the Isra'iliyyat. And while the story of the gnat boring its way into the brain of Nimrod to cause his ultimate death is told by several Moslem writers,²⁵ the humorous web spun round this theme in our MS.

²⁵ Kisa'i, p. 141; Balkhi, vol. III, p. 56 (Arab. text); Mirkhond, *Rauzat-us-Safa*, vol. I, p. 143.

is not found elsewhere. The tale of the usurper and the pleasantry about the sailing vessel are evidently based upon Midrashic sources,²⁶ and the story about the woman in travail seems to be post-Amoraic folklore.

The translation is fairly faithful except that occasionally the translator, because of his penchant for numbers, gives free rein to his imagination. Thus the number of the swords which were broken on the miraculously hardened neck of the warden is given as "about two hundred" (15a), and that of the burned soldiers of Nimrod's army as "about one hundred thousand" (15b). In neither case is a number indicated in the original. He fails to translate בכריעה והשתחוויה (*Bet ha-Midr.*, p. 27, l. 1), probably because of his reluctance to ascribe to Abraham a Mohammedan practice. Evidently the Hebrew translator had a keener sense for historical perspective and must have been quite mindful of the fact that genuflection and prostration also formed part of biblical worship. It should also be noted that while the original introduces the story with the very indefinite אמרו, the translation is begun with קאלו רבותינו ו"ל. The last episode too is preceded by קאל אלאסידר. But this does not necessarily mean that the translator believed that the entire tale or part of it was rabbinic. In his excessive zeal to impart to it a Midrashic coloring he might have been somewhat unscrupulous about the authenticity of his sources. Abraham bar Hisdai permits himself a similar liberty. In his *Mozne Sodeq* he quotes Koranic verses in the name of a sage²⁷ and in one instance cites a statement concerning Rabbi Aqiba which in the original is made about 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭab.²⁸

The orthography is both irregular and inconsistent; cf. סדר (2a) for צדר, במקם (2a) for במקאם, לחלהא (3b) for לחאלהא, ואקח, לחאלהא (3b) for לחאלהא, נאצר (5a) and נאצרו (21a), אדומה (12b) and קדומה (12b), כצרהום (13a) and כסרתהום (13a), מתצאייק (18a) and ומתדאייק (18b), etc. The פ has usually a dot over it, and here and there a word is vocalized with Hebrew vowels. פי is often equivalent to the conjunction פ; cf. פאראח (14b) for פי אראח, פארר etc. On

²⁶ Cf. Tanḥuma, Ber., 7, [G].

²⁷ Ed. Goldenthal, p. 68 and p. 126; *Mizan al-A'mal*, Cairo, 1910, p. 62 (Sura 45, 22) and p. 115 (Sura 24, 21).

²⁸ *Mozne Sodeq*, p. 69; *Mizan al-A'mal*, p. 63.

the other hand, the preposition פִּי is sometimes spelled פ and united with the following word; cf. פִּי נָמִיעַ (1b) for פִּי נָמִיעַ.

All the vulgar words occurring in the story are found in Dozy. The final episodes (18a-21b), which have no Hebrew counterpart, I have translated into Hebrew. These will be found preceding the Arabic text.

TRANSLATION

- 18a וכעבור זמן מה גדל אברהם אבינו ע"ה וישב אליו נמרוד וינשק לו וידגדגו ויזמינהו [ולארמונו] ויעמד אברהם לפניו ויאמר אליו נמרוד שמע בקולי והאמן בי ועבדני ואני אשימך לראש שרי ולא יהיה אחד גדול ונכבד ממך ויאמר לו אברהם אל תשאלני דבר זה עתה כי רוחי תציקני ויאמר לו נמרוד ומה זה ידאיב נפשך ויאמר לו אברהם לפני זמן מה ראיתי גר אחד מארץ רחוקה ואאספֿהו אל ביתי ועכשו הוא רוצה שיהיה הוא || הראש וימשל 18b בי ומגמתו היא להתיחר על כל בני הבית ואין אני יכול לנצחו ועל זה אני מצטער ויאמר לו נמרוד מיד נשלח ונודיענו ונאמר לו אם בגאווה אתה בוחר בקש לך מקום שבו תוכל לעלות לגדולה והתנשא והתגדל שם כי אין מן הנמוס שתתעלה במקום שאין מכירים אותך ויאמר לו אברהם ישמעו אוניך מה שפיך אומר. דע כי עולם זה ברשותו של הקב"ה ואם תרצה שתתגדל וכי יעבדוך הברואים ברא לך עולם זולתו ומלך ורדה בו כי אין מן ההגון שהאלקים ית' יסייעך בעולמו ואתה עומד במרדך [ובראשונה] צא מעולמו [ואח"כ] הפך זמם נאותך ויאמר לו אין לאל ידי לתקן עולם בפני עצמי 19a ויאמר לו אברהם || שים לבך והתבונן אם אין ביכולתך לבראתו מדוע תצווני שאעבדך כופר מכחיש מטרף הדעת וינער בו נמרוד ויגרשהו וילך מפניו. ואחרי זמן מה שוב הזמין את אברהם ויעמד לפניו ויתחל נמרוד לנשקו ולדגדגו ויאמר לו הלא תעבדני ותאמין בי ויאמר לו אברהם חכה עד בקר עד שאמלך בלבי ואז אניד לך דבר לאמתו. ולמחרתו שלח המלך לקרוא לאברהם ויתנכר לקשה רוח ויאמר לו נמרוד מה יום מיומים כי נפלו פניך ותוהה תכסמו ויאמר לו מוטב שלא תשאלני מה אירע לי ויאמר לו נמרוד הגידה נא לי ואני אולי אועיל ואעזר לך ויאמר לו אברהם לי בת יחידה 19b שאין || על עפר משלה והיא מליל אתמול על האבנים ועדיין לא ילדה ועוברת חציו מדולדל וחציו בתוך מעיה והיא כמו מתה ויאמר לו נמרוד בחר לך אחת משתי אלה אם תרצה נבתק את העובר ונוציאנו קטוע ותשאר אמו בחיים ואם לאו ננתח בטן האם וחמות היא והולד יתקיים ויאמר לו לא טובה היא עצתך רצוני הוא כי לשניהם לא יבולע ויאמר לו נמרוד וכי אפשר זה ויאמר לו אברהם שלח מאתך ציר יולדה יחלץ נפש מן נפש ויאמר לו וכי ממונה

אני על הלדה ויאמר לו אברהם שים לבך והתבונן אם אף על ציר לא תשלוט ואיך תצונוי שאעבדך כופר מכחיש לו בעל שכל היית כי עתה לא צויתני 20a
 20a שאעבדך ואאמין || כך ויצא מאתו. וכעבור זמן מה שב התחיל נמרוד לנשקן ולדגנו ויאמר לו עבדני והאמן בי ואל תמרה פי ואני. אגמלך כל טוב ויאמר לו אברהם חכה עד בקר עד שתתישב דעתי ואניד לך דבר לאמתו וביום המחרת בבקר שלח המלך לקרוא לאברהם וכאשר אך נכנס שוב התנכר לשרוי בצער גדול ויאמר לו נמרוד מדוע פניך זועפים ויאמר לו אברהם מוטב שלא תשאל מה אירע לי הנה כל חילי וקניני בספינה והיא באה אל הנמל והסער מליל אתמול מתחולל ואני מביט על רכושי ואני נהנה ממנו ומתירא אני שמא יקרה לה אסון ויאמר לו נמרוד אל תירא מיד אשלח לך || 20b
 20b חבר מלחים בדוגיות קטנות המכנות סירות מפרש וימשכו הספינה בחבלים עד אשר יכניסוה בשלום אל הנמל ויאמר אברהם לנמרוד ולמה כל הטרחה הזו שלח רוח מאתך ותנשב במפרש ותכניס את הספינה בלי עמל ויגיעה ויאמר לו נמרוד האם שולט אני על הרוח ויאמר לו אברהם כופר מכחיש אם אינך שולט ברוח ואיך תאמר לי כי אעבדך ואני לא אעבד אלא את האלהים אשר הוא כל יכול והוא ממית ומחיה ה' הוא האלהים אדון האדונים ואלהי האלהים ואתה נמרוד כופר מכחיש תאכל משלו ותעבד זולתו ואפילו ברוחך אינך שולט ומחר אפשר אתה מת ואין חי לנצח || אלא רבון העולמים חי 21a
 21a וקיים לעד. אמרו רבותינו [ו"ל] כי נמרוד מעוצם כפירתו ורשעתו שם את עצמו לאלהים דורש עבודת הבריות עד אשר שלח אליו הקב"ה את הבקה ר"ל היתוש שהוא קטן כל הברואים וחלש כל היצורים ויצוהו כי יקם מזה הכופר ויבוא היתוש באפו ויעל למוחו וימץ לשדו יומם ולילה בלי הרף ותקצר יד הרופאים מרפאו ובאחד הימים נכנס אצלו השטן בצורת בן אדם ויברכהו בשלום וכאשר ראהו סובל יסוריו הנוראים אמר אליו איעצך עצה טובה שתחלצך ממחלתך האנושה ואת היא אשר תצק צורת ראש מזהב טהור ותקבע 21b
 21b בה עינים של יהלום ותסיר || ראשך הכואב מעליך ותשים במקומו את ראש הזהב ומפני מרי כאבו ונביבות מוחו שגרם לו היתוש הסכים לעצה זו וימר כי תיכף יתיכו ראש זהב טהור ויקבעו בו עיני יהלום וככלות המלאכה מיד צוה שיקטעו ראשו ויעשה כך וימת וימר מארץ חיים ויפצחו גלגלתו ויצאו ממנה את היתוש וימצאוהו כשעור גזל יונה וישימוהו על כף מאזנים ויהי משקלו עשרים וארבע אבן כים ברוך מאבד הרשעים ברה"י ואתה בן אדם קח מוסר ושים אל לבך מה גדלו מעשי אל משגיא לרשע ומאריך לו וכל מה שהוא חוטא עוד יוסיף לו כח למען יגדל עונו וסופו יזניחו ללחך עפר וגם מפגרו יקח נקם כמו ששמענו ונדענה האל ישתבח מאביד הערצים על ידי חלש כל היצורים אשר כל הנך יכול אפיל תחנוני לפניך שתרדם ותחוס עלי למען שמך הגדול ולמען אוהבך וידידך אברהם אבינו ע"ה.

* Evidently an improvised ברכה, based upon Prov. 11, 10, G].

קוצת אברהם אבינו ע"ה

- 1a קאלו רבותינו ז"ל אן קבל מא יכלק אברהם כאן נמרוד כאפיר פי אמאנית
אלחק סו' וכאן מתעטס פי זאתו ויקול עלא רוחו אנהו אלאה ואהל זמאנו
אלאוולניין כאנו יעבדה ויסגדרו] להו ואמה אל מלך דה כאן יערף פי [עלם]
אלנגם פי נצר פי עלם אל כוואכב . . . מוועוד יתואליד אנסאן ואחד פי זמאנה
ויוקף קוצאדו וינכר אמנתו ויגלבו ויפסד עקידתו פי אנגעז אל מלך געז
כבירה ומן כופו ומן רעבת קלבו ארסל גדה לגמיע אלבשוואת ואל חוכאם
ואל חר אלדי הום מן תחת חוכמו ואכבר להום אלדי נצרו פעלמו וקאל
1b להום אש תשורו עלייה נצנע פי הדא || אלולד אלדי מוועוד לייני קאלו להו
אל שורה הייא אנך תבני בית כבירה ותגעל בוואב עלא אל באב ותרסל
מנאדי ינאדי פנמיע מדאיין צלטנתך עלא גמיע אל נסה אלדי הום חבאלה
יו וינגמעו פי דאלך אלבית וענד מא ינגמעו וינחמו ולם יתפצל גס מרא חבלה
פי אל מדאיין ינו איצה אל דייאת ויוקעדו חדאהום ויחרצוהום לווקת
ולדתהום וחיין תני אל מרא לתוליד ינצורו אן כאן ולד הווא ידבחו עלא
בטנהא ואן כאן בנת תעיש ויעשו בקשיש לאומהא וילבסוהא חוואייג אל צלטנה
ויכרגוהא מן הנאך במוכב עטים וינאדו לקודמהא כדה ינצנע ללמרא אלדי
תוליד בנת פי למה סמע אל מלך שורתהום פרח פרחא עשימה קאוי נאדה
פי גמיע מדאיין צלטנתו אן ינו כול אל מעלמין אל בניין ליבנו בית כבירה
2a לל מלך עלו סתין || דרע ווסעו חמנין דרע ובעד מא פרג ליבני אל בית
נאדה אן ינו גמיע אל נסוואן אל חבאלה לדאלך אל בית ויפצלו הנאך לווקת
ולדתהום וואכיל ווכלה לאנל מגיבתהום הנאך איצא ואכיל ווכלה עלא אל
בית חוראץ ליחרצו עלא אל באב ללא יחרבו איצה ווכל עליהום נסוואן
דייאת ליוולדוהום וחכם עליהום אן אל ולד אלדי יתואליד ידבחו עלא סדר
אומו ואל בנת אלדי תתואליד ילבסו אומהא חוואייג כיתן וחריר ואטלו
ויכרגוהא מן הנאך במוכב עטים אן כדה אמר אל מלך ויווצלוהא למא ביתהא
במקם עטים קאל אל מגיד אן אנקתלו עלא אל אמר דה אכתר מן סבעין
אלף ולד פלמה נצרו אל מלאייכה קתלת הדא אל אוולאד קאלו קוראם
אל חק סו' יא רבון של עולם הוודא אש צנע הדא אל כאפר נמרוד אבן
2b כנען אלדי קתל קדר אש אוולאד || וסכב דמהום עלא אל ארץ עלו וולש
פיקאל להום אל חק סו' יא מלאייכתי אל מוקדסין עארף ונאצר לאני לא
אנפל ולא אנאם ונאצר אנה ועארף אל מכפייאת ואלמכשופאת ודל וקת
תנצורו אש נצנע פי הדא אל רשע אלכאפר . קאל אל מגיד אן פי דאלך
אל וקת אראחת אום אברהם ואתגוזית ואחד יוסמה תרח וחבלת מנו וכאן
בעד תלאחת שהור כוברת בטנהא ואצפר גההא פי קאל להא תרח גההא
מאליך יא מרא וגהיך אצפר ובטניך כבירה פי קאלת להו כול סנה מעודה
יגרא לי כדה וגיני הדא אל תשוויש ויוסמא תשוויש אל אולנג לאן תשוויש
אל קולנג יכבר אל בטן ויצפאר אל גה. קאל להא פרגיני בטניך ביין לי

- אניך חבלה ואן כאן כרה מוש ואגב עליה נעאדו עלא וציית אלאהנה נמרוד
 3a פי געל ידו עלא בטנהא עמל להא || ה'ק'ב'ה' נס ושובוט אל צגיר לפוק
 ופתש פי בטנהא ולם וגד שי פי קאל להא צדקתי במא נטקתי ולם אנערף
 אלאמר לחין מא כומלו אשהור חבלהא ומן כותר כופהא כרגית מן אל בלד
 ומשיית פי אל כלה אלא חין וצלת לנהר פי ואגדית מנארה כבירה ודכלת
 פי קלבהא תאני יום מסכהא אל טלק וולדת ולד מחל מא נויל נוואר ובקית
 דל מנארה מנוורא כלשמס מן וגה דאלך אלולד פלמה נצרת אומו דאלך
 פרחת פרחת עטימה ואל ולד דה הווא אברהם אבינו ע"ה פי פתחת פומהא
 וקאלת אל וויל עלייא אלדי ולדתך פי הדא אל וקת אלי אל צולטאן נמרוד
 3b קתל עלא שאנך נחו ען סבעין אלף ולד ואנה כאייפה || עליך קאוי ללא
 יערף באך ויקתלך פי כדה אל אחסן תמות פי האדי אל מנארא ולא ינצורוך
 עינייא מדבוח עלא סדרי וקלעית מן אל מלבוס אלדי עליהא ולבסחתו וסייבתו
 פי אל מנארא ואראחית וקאלת להו אלאהך יכון פי עונאך וארחית לחלהא.
 קאל אל מגיד אן אברהם הווא לסע פי אל מנארא והווא ולד צונאר ולם
 כאן ענדו מורצעא תרצאעו בכי פי סמע אל חק סו' בוכה ורסל להו אל
 מלאך גבריאל וחט אידו פי פומו ובקא ינאויל להו מנהא לבן וצאר ירצע
 מן אצבעו לענד מא בקא עומרו עשרת אייאם וכדי ימשי פי אל ארץ וכרג
 מן אל מנארה ומשי עלא חפית אל נהר ולמא גומצת אל שמס וטלעו אלגום
 קאל דול הום אל אלאה- ובעד || למא טלע אל נהאר נטר אלא אל שמס
 4a קאל דה אלאהי ואעברו ולמא גומצת אלשמס קאל דה מוש אלאה נצר אלא
 אל קמר קאל דה אלאהי ואעברו פלמא אצלם אל קמר קאל דה מוש אלאה
 יבקא להום ואחד מסירהום הווא אלדי אעברו ליסע ביתכלם וגאלו אל
 מלאך גבריאל וקאל להו סלאם ועליך יא אברהם קאלו ועליך אל סלאם
 מין אנתה קאלו אנה גבריאל רסול אל חק תעאלא פי דאלך אל ואקת אראח
 אברהם למנבע מא ונסל ידיה ורגלה ווגהו וצלה לל חק תיעאלא- קאל
 אל מגיד אן אוס אברהם אפתכרת אבנהא ובכיית בוכה אן שריד וכרגית
 ברא אל בלד לתפתיש עלא אבנהא פי אל מנארא וסייבתו הנאך ולם ווגדתו
 חוזרת לתבכי כמאן עליה וצארית תקול אלוייל עלייא אלדי ולדתך כטיפה
 לווחוש אל || גיט לל צבועה וללאדייאב ובקית משיית עלא חפית אל נהר ונצרת
 4b אלא אבנהא ולם ערפתו לאן כובר קאוי פי קאלת להו סלאם ועליך פי רץ להא
 אל סלאם וקאל להא ליש מאשיייה פי האדא אל כליה קאלת להו כרגת נפתש
 עלא אבני קאל להא ואבניך מן גאבו הנה קאלת אנה כונת חבלת מן תרח
 גווי ופי וקת אל ולארה כופת עלא אבני אלדי כאן פי בטני ללא יקתלו
 צולטננה נמרוד אבן כנען מתל מא קתל סבעין אלף ולד וגית אל מנארא
 אלדי פי הדא אל נהר ומסכני אל טלק וולדת ולד וסייבתו פי אל מנארא
 ורוחת אלא ביתי ודל וקת גית נפתיש עליה ולם ווגדתו קאל להא אברהם
 אל כלאם אלדי בתקולי עליה בקא לו כאם יום קאלת לו קדר עשרין יום
 קאל להא פי מרא פי אל דונייא חסייב אבנהא צונייר פי אל ברייה לואחרו

- 5a ותני תפתש עליה בעד עשרין || יום קאלת הייא בלכי יחנין עליה אל כאלק חועאלא קאל להא אבניך אלדי גאיייה תפתשי פי הדא אל נהר הווא אנה ואנתי אומי ואנה אבניך קאלת לו יא אבני יא כבורת כדה ומשית עלא רגליך ואתכלמת בפומך וכול דה פי עשרין יום קאל להא איי נעם ותערפי יא אומי אן מווגוד פי אל דונייא אלאה עטים וכביר חי וקייזם נאצור ולא יתנצר והווא פי אל סמא ומלוו כול אל ארץ וקארו קאלת לו יא אבני הווא פי אלאה גיר נמרוד קאל להא איי נעם אלאה אל סמא ואל ארץ ואלאה נמרוד אבן כנען ועלא דאלך תרוחי לנמרוד ותכבריה בהדא אל כלאם פי אראחית אל בלד וחכית לתרח גוהא כיף נצרת אבנהא ותרח כאן באשה כביר ענד נמרוד פי חין סמע כלאמהא פי אל וקת ואל סעא אראח לל צראייה מוצע אלדי קאעד אל צולטאן נמרוד ווקף קודאמו וסגד לל ארץ || ופי דאלך אל וקת כול אחדן אלדי יתקדם קודאם אלצולטאן נמרוד יתם מכפי עלא אל ארץ קודאמו חתא יקול להו ארפע ראסך ואטלוּב סואלך פי קאל נמרוד לתרח ארפע ראסך ואטלוּב סואלך קאלו יא סייאדי יטיל עומרך וגית נבשרך עלא אלדי נצרת חצרתך פי עלם אל גנום אן מוועוד ולד יתואליד פי צלטנתך ויפסיד עקידתך וקתלת עלא שאנו אכתר מן סבעין אלף ולד פי נבשרך אני הווא אבני ואומו כאנת חבלה ולם מעייה פכר פי חבלהא לאן קאלת אנהא עייאנה ופתשת בטנהא ולם וגדת חאנה וכאן למא פרנו אשהור אל חבל כרגית ברֶא אל בלד ונצרת הנאך מנארה ולדית הינאך ולד וסייבתו לווחוש אלייט ובעד עשרין יום אראחת ונצרתו מאשי עלא חפית אל נהר וביתכלם מהל ואחד כביר וביקול אן מווגוד אלאה פי אל || סמא נאצור ולא יתנצר ואחד ולם להו תאני וכאן למא סמע נמרוד הדא אל כלאם אנגענו געזה כבירה קאוי וקאל למשוורו ובשוואתו אש נצנע פי הדא אל ולד פי קאלו להו אש אל סירה מן ולד צונייר תכאף ומווגוד פי גמיע צלטנתך אלף אל אלוף בשוואת וחוכאם ועסכר שי לא יעד ולא יחצה ואחד מן אל בשוואת אוו מן אל חוכאם ינמע גומלת עסכר וירוח ויניבו ונגעלו פי אל חבס קאל להום עומרכום שופתו פי זמנכום ואחד אבן עשרין יום ימשי עלא רגליה ויתכלים מהל ואחד כביר ויקול אן פיה אל סמא ואחד ולם להו תאני נאצור ולם יתנצר - קאל אל מגיד אן כול אל בשוואת אלדי כאנו הנאך אתעגבו גאייית אל עגב מן הדא אל כלאם בין כדה ובין כדה גיה אל שיטן בשבה בן אדם ולאבס לבס אסווד ואראח וסגד קודאם אל צולטאן נמרוד לענד מא קאל להו || אל צולטאן ארפע ראסך ואטלוּב סואלך פי קאל להו מאלך כדה ממנום וכולכום מתעגבין מן ולד צונייאר אנה אשור עליך כיף תעמיל פי קאל להו אל צולטאן איש שורתך קאל להו אפתח מכאון אלאת אלחרב ואעטי לכול אל אנוואת ואל כואכי ואל בשוואת וכול אהל אל חרב וארסלהום אליה אינו גיי יעבדך ויכון תחת ידך - קאל אל מגיד אן ווצא אל צולטאן לכל אל בשוואת ולכול אהל אל חרב אנהום יגו ויאכדו סלאח מן כונית אל צולטאן וירוחו גייבו אברהם. פי חין מא נצר אברהם אבינו אן גו אליה קום כתיר מסכתו אל רעבה ופוע
- 5b
- 6a
- 6b

כתיר מן קובלהום וסרך לאילאה אלסמא אינו יכלצו מן ידהום אן הוא
 אל מוכאלץ אל פקיר מן אשד מנו ואנתה תכלצני יארבי מנהום פי סמע אל רב
 אלא צרכתו ונצר אלא דמועו ורסל להו אל מלאך גבריאלי יכלצו ||
 מן ידהום. קאל להו אל מלאך מא לך יא אברהם ליש אנתה בתבכי קאל
 7a להו כופת מן הדא אל ארגאל אלדי גאיין עלייא יתלונני פי קאל להו
 אל מלאך לס חכאף ולס תפוע אן אללה מעך והו יכלצך מן כל אעדאך.
 קאל אל מגיד אן אל חק סו' וצא לגבריאלי אן יעל גמס ודמסיה בינו ובינהום
 פי חין מא נצרו אל גמס ואל צלאם ואל דמסה אנפועו ורגעו אלא נמרוד
 צולטאנהום וצארו יקולו להו נרוח ונרתחיל מן הדא אלצלטנה פי חין מא
 סמע אל צולטאן כדה אעטא דראהם לכל בשוואתו ועבירו וארתחלו מן
 הנאך אלא מדינת בוגד פי בעד מא ארתחלו קאל אללה סו' לגבריאלי ארוח
 קול לאברהם אנהו ירוח ורא אלעדו נמרוד לבבל קאל להו אברהם לס
 ענדי מוניח אל טריך ולא ראס כיל נרכב עליהא ולא עסכר לנצנע מעו חרב
 קאל להו אל מלאך גבריאלי לס תחמל הם שיי מן דאלך || ולא אנתה עייז
 7b לא לאכל ולא לשורב ולא עסכר תחארב מעו אלא עלא כתפי תרכב ואנה
 אחמלך ואווצלך למא לבבל פי דאלך אל חין קאם אברהם ורכב עלא כתף
 אל מלאך גבריאלי פי רמשיית עין אלתקא רוחו עלא באב מדינת בבל וקאל
 להו אדכול פי אל מדינה ונאדי בצוט עאלי וקול ה' הוא האלהים בשמים
 ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת אין עוד אחד ואין שני לים להו שבתה גוף והוא
 אלאה אל אלאהא ואלאה נמרוד ואנה אברהם עבדו נאמן ביתו אראח
 אברהם אבינו ע"ה ונאדה בצוט עאלי פי כל אל מדינה וקאל ה' הוא האלהים
 והוא אחד ואין שני והוא אלאה אל סמוואת והוא אל אלאה אל עטים באצט
 אל סמוואת ואלאראצ'י וכאלק אל בחור ואל גיבאל ואלאה כל אל דונייא
 ואנה אברהם עבדו נאמן ביתו שיהו כולהום ארגאל ונסא עלא דאלך אנהו
 חק וכמאן תשהדו אני אנה אברהם עבדו נאמן ביתו וצאר || מאשי פי
 8a אל אסוואק ואלרחבאת וינאדי פי ווגד אבוה ואומו וכמאן ווגד אל מלאך
 גבריאלי קאל להו אל מלאך יא אברהם קול לאבוך ולאומך אנהום יאמנו
 כמאן הומאן וישהדו כדאלך אלדי אנתה בתנאדי אן אללה הו חק וליס גיר
 פי חין מא סמע אברהם כלאם אל מלאך קאל לאבוה ולאומך אנתו תעברו
 בן אדם זייכום ותסגרו להו ותסגרו לצורה אלדי מתל צורת נמרוד תפחמו
 אן להום פום ולם ינטק להו עינין ולם ינצור ולם להו גנס נפע לא לנפסו
 ולא לל גיר פי חין מא סמע תרח כלאמו אכדו כל חילה וגאבו לביתו וחכה
 להו גמיע מא גרא להו אנו ביום ואחד משי משי ארבעין יום פי חין מא סמע
 תרח האדא אל כלאם אראח לענד נמרוד וקאל להו תעלם יא סידי אן
 אל ולד אבני אלדי אנתה הרבן מנו אהו גיה וסאלתו כאם יום בקא לך מאשי
 8b פי אל || טריק קאל לי אמס תאריכו אנתקלת מן מוצעי ואל יום גית הנה.
 פי חין מא סמע דאלך אל צולטאן אנגעז נעזה עטימה כבירה וקאל קודאם
 אל בשוואת ואל משירין. ואל עולמה שורו עלינה אש נצנע מעא הדא אל ולד

פי גאובו גמיע יעיש אל צולטן נמרוד נישלוק מנאדי ינאדי פי גמיע אלמדינה
 עזימה ופרחה זינה סבעת אייאם וכול ראגל יפרח פי ביתו וילבס אעז מא
 עגדו ותכון גמיע אל מדינה מחשוטה ופרחנה וכמאן תצנע פי חוש אל מלך
 אל גווייה ואל ברנייה ופי כול מדאין צלטנתך וקווית קודרתך ינו כול אל נאם
 ויעבדוך פי אמר אל מלך כדאלך ונולית אל מגדייה פי גמיע אל בלד ולבסו
 גמיע אל נאם אעז מא ענדהום וזינו אל בלד זינה עטימה אלדי לס כאן
 מתלהא כל חי עלא קדר מוקדרתו פצנעו דאלך. וכאן בעד דאלך חין מא
 קאעד אל || מלך נמרוד עלא כורסי צלטנתו ארסל נראה לאברהם וגה 9a
 אברהם ואבדו מעו ופאת אברהם קודאם אל בשוואת ואל כוואכי לחין מא
 חצאל לכורסי אל מלך אלדי הווא קאעד עליה ומסך פי אל כורסי וסרך
 בצוש עאלי כהדא אל כלאם וקאל פי נמרוד אל כאפר פי אל אצל וכאפר
 פי אברהם עבדו נאמן ביתו פי קאלו להו אהו אל מלך נמרוד פי קאל להו
 יא נמרוד קול מתלי אן ה' הוא האלהים בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת
 ואחר ולא להו תאני והו חי לא ינפל ולא ינאם ואשהד ואמן אני אנה אברהם
 והו כאלק כול אל דוגייה עלא שאן יאמנו פיה כול אל נאם ורפע צוטו בהדא
 אל כלאם פי חין מא רפע צוטו בהדא אל כלאם אל צנם אלדי כאן הנאך
 אלדי עמלינו בצורת נמרוד וקע ואנכפה עלא ווגהו פי אל ארץ ואלדי || כאנו 9b
 ווקפין הנאך קודאם אברהם אלאנוואת ווקעו כולהום עלא וגההום ודאב
 קלבהום ופצלו מרמיין מוגמיין פי אלארץ קדר סעתין ובעדו צחיו מן גשוותהום
 וקאל אל מלך יא אברהם הדא אל חיס חיסך אוו חס אלאהך פי קאל להו
 הדא אל חס חס מכלוקה צוניירה מן גומלת אל כלאיין אלדי כלקהום אל חק
 סו' פי דאלך אל חין קאל אל מלך נמרוד חקיק לאן אלאהך אלאה עטים
 והווא אלאה אל אלאהאט וסיד אל אסייאר וקאל לתרח אבדו אחמל אבנך
 וכדורו עני וסאפר לבלדך ואראחו פ' בעד דאלך כובור אברהם למא בקא
 עומרו עשרין סנה ותרח אבדו צועוף פי קאל לאוולאדו הרן ואברהם
 בחייתאכום יא אוולדי אנכום תביעו לי הדא אל אתנין אצנאם לאן לס בקא
 ענדי דראהם לל מצרוף ואראח הרן ובעלו צנם ואחד וגאב פלוס || לאגל 10a
 מצרוף אבדו פי אכר אברהם אתנין צולבאן וגעל פי רקבתהום חבל וצאר
 ירגרהום מכפיין עלא ווגההום עלא אל ארץ ובקא יסחבהום ויסרוך ויקול
 יאמין ישתרי צנם אלדי לים נפע לא לו ולא לל גיר ולא לאלדי ישתריה
 ליעבדו וכמאן להו פום ולם ינטק עינין ולם יצור אוודאן ולם יסמע רגלין
 ולם ימשי פי חין מא סמעו אהל אל מדינה אלא כלאם אברהם אתענבו קאוי
 קאוי פי בין מא הו מאשי אלא וצאדף ואחר עגוזה וקאל להו בחייתאך יא
 אברהם אנאך תנאקי לי צנם ואחד יכון טייב וכביר לאגל נעבדו פי קאל
 להא אברהם יא עגוזה לס אנה שאיין פיהום גס נפע לא פי אל כביר ולא
 פי אל צונייר לא לנפסהום ולא לל גיר וקאל להא אל צנם אל כביר אלדי
 10b אשתרתי אמס מן אכוייה אש גרא פיה || קאלת להו גו אלחרמייה בליל וסרקו
 ואנה כונת לסע פי אל חמאם קאל להא אן כאן כדה כיף תעבדי לל צנם אן

אפעל לנפסו לם ערף יכלץ מן אל חרמייה פי כיף יערף יכאלץ אל גיר
 מן אזייתהום ארוחי יענוה יא מגנוה וכיף תקולי אן אל צנם אלדי תעבדי
 הווא אלאה אן כאן אלאה לש לם קדר יכאלץ נפסו מן אל חרמייה אלא
 הווא צנם אלדי לים להו נפע לא לנפסו ולא לאלדי יעבדו פי קאלת להו
 אן כאן כדה יא אברהם בכלאמך למין נעביד קאל להא אעבדי לאלאה
 אל אלאהאט וסייד אל אסייאר כאלק אל סמא ואל ארץ וכאלק אל בחר
 וגמיע אלדי פיה ואלאה נמרוד ואלאה תרח ואלאה אלשרק ואלגרב קבלי
 ובחרי ואלאה גמיע אדדונייה ברוך הוא וברוך שמו ומין הווא אל כלב נמרוד
 11a אלדי יעמל רוחו אלאה יעבדוה || אלנאס קאל פי סעתהא אל ענוה מן דל
 וקת וראייח לם אעבד גיר אלאהך יא אברהם ולאה אן כאן נעבדו אש נפע
 יגיני קאל להא גמיע מא סרקו לכי אל חרמייה ירגעו לכי וגיר דאלך תכאלצי
 נפסך מן גהינם פי קאלת להו אלענוה אש אקול למא אכלץ נפסי מן גהינם
 קאל להא קולי ה' הוא האלהים בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת אחד ואין
 שני פי קאלת אלענוה מן דל וקת וראייח אקול בכלאמך ואשחר אן אללה
 חק ואסמך חק ואנתה אב' עבדו נאמן ביתו* קאל אל מגיד אן רגעת אלענוה
 בתשובה וגדמית עלא אלדי כאנת תעבד אל צנם וכמאן רגעו להא אל חרמייה
 גמיע מא סרקו להא וכמאן אכדת אל ענוה אל צנם וכסרתו בל חגר וקאלת
 לו אל ויל עליך ועלא אלדי יעבדך כמאן לאן לם להו נפע לא לך ולא
 11b לל גיר || וכרגית מן ביתהא פי אל אסוואק ואלרחבאט תועק ותנאדי בצוט
 עאלי ותקול אלדי יחוב יכלץ מן גהינם ירוח יעבד לאלאה אברהם* קאל
 אל מגיד אן כול יום עלא הדא אל חאל למא רגעו בתשובה נאס כחיר פי
 סמע אל מלך הדא אל קול ארסל גדה לל ענוה וקאל להא מא ליך יא
 ענוה אנתי אחננתי ומיילתי מן עבדתי לש לם תעבדיני מוש אנה אלדי כלקתך
 וצוורתך בימיני פי גובתו אל ענוה וקאלת להו אנתה מן אל כראבין ואנתה
 כאפר פי אלאה אברהם אלד הוא ואחד ולא להו תאני ואנתה תאכול מן
 כירו ותעבד גירו ותכפר פיה ופי שריעתו ופי אברהם עבדו פי חין מא סמע
 אל מלך כלאם אל ענוה אמר בקתלהא פי אל חין קתלהא ופוע ואתרעש
 קלבו מן כלאמהא וקאל פי באלו אש נצנע מעא אברהם אלדי פסד עקידתי
 12a לאן כותרת אל נאס אמנו פי אלאה אברהם פי || חין מא נצרו אכאברו אלא
 אל גס בתעל מלך קאלו להו קום בל עגל אלא מוצע אלדי מעוור תרוח
 פי ונאדי פי אל מדינה אן סבעת אייאם יעמלו זינה אחסן מן אל זינה
 אל אוולנייה וילבס כול חי אעז מא ענדו מן אפכר אל מלבוס וכולהום יגו
 ויסתקעדו פיך פי חין מא סמע אל מלך דאלך פרח ואנבצט וקאם ואראח
 לדאלך אל מוצע ועמלו זינה ועזומה עזימה אפכר מן אל אוולנייה ואכל
 ושורב וסוכר כיד המלך וכאן פי וצט אל עזומה קאל אל מלך לתרח אבו
 אברהם רוח האת אבנך כליה יגי יתפרג עלא דל עז ואל אנעאם וכותרת

* Hebrew אפילו; cf. *REJ*, vol. LXX, 37 l. 4 and n. 4.

אל כדם פי אראח תרח וקאל לאבנו יא אבני קום אתפרג עלא עזומת נמרוד
 12b צולטננה ואלהנה פי קאל להו אברהם סמחני לם || אקדר ארוח פי קאל
 להו אן כדה כלי באלך עלא אל אצנם עלא מא גני מן הנאך וכאן הנאך
 צנם אל צולטאן פי נצר אברהם אן אראח אלצולטאן למוצע אל זינה ואל
 עזומה בתעתו אכד אדומה ונול פי דל אצנם בדה פי אל כביר וכמל פי
 אל צונייד למא לם כלה ולא ואחד מנהום אלי כסר ראסו ואלי קלע עינו
 ואלי כסר דראעו ואלי כסאר רגלה וחדפהום מן עלא כראסיהום וקאל ה'
 הוא האלהים וחט אל קדומה פי איד כבירהום פי בעד דאלך אנתמו אייאם
 עזומת אל מלך וגה אל מלך אלא ינצר אלא אצנם מכאסרין וקאל מין אלדי
 עמל דאלך פי קאמו גמיע אל עביד סארכין באכין ויקולו יאסיידנה אל מלך
 13a לם כאן הנה אלא אברהם ואחנה סמענא ביכסאר פיהום פי אמר אל || מלך
 בחצור אברהם פי חצור אברהם קאל להו אל מלך ליש כצארת הדא אל
 אצנאם פי קאל להו אברהם אנה לם כסרתהום דה כבירהום אלדי כצרהום
 ואן כאן לם תצדקני אסאלו והו אל אדום לסע מעו פי דאלך אל חין אמר
 בחבסו פי ארסל ורא אל סגאן וקאל להו כוד דל ולד ואחבסו ענדך ולם
 תעטי להו לא אכל ולא שורב " קאל אל מגיד פי חין מא דכל אברהם אלא
 אל חכם רפע איניה אלא אל סמא אל אעלה וקאל יארבון העולמים יא אדוני
 האדונים ואנתה עאלם וגירך לם יעלם אני לם חצלת דל מחצול אלא לאגל
 מוחבתך ואלחק סו' סמע צלאתו וקאל לל מלאך גבריאל אנול וכלצו מן
 13b יד הדא אל כאפר פי נויל להו אל מלאך גבריאל וקאל || להו שלום עליכם
 פי קאל להו עליכם שלום מין אנתה יאסידי קאלו אנה גבריאל רסול אל חק
 סו' וארסלני לך נבשרך בלפרג לך קריב פי אן לם תכאף אללה מעאך פי
 אל חין פתח עיניה אברהם ונצר ביר אומייה חלווה קודאמו ושרב ובקא אל
 מלאך יגיב להו כול יום אל אכל וקעד מעו יוויסו למא קעד הנאך סנה
 כאמלה פי בעד מא כומלת אל סנה גו אנוואת אל מלך יאכלו וישרבו ויסכרו
 מעא אל מלך וקאלו להו יאמלך אאמור אן יעמלו אתון וימלו חטב קדר
 כומסמיית אלף חמלה ויעטו אל נאר למא תטלע אל שעלולה לל גו אל
 אעלה וארמי פי וצטהא אברהם ובעד דאלך יאמנו פיך גמיע אלכלאייק
 ולם תפסד עקידתך פי פרח אלמלך פרחה עטימה עלא הדא אל שורא ||
 14a ואמר אן יצנעו אתון ואמר אן כול ראגל ומרא וצבי ושיך יגו וילמו חטב למא
 ימלו דאלך אלמוצע ובדיין אל נאם ילמו חטב למא מלו הדא אל מוצע לאן
 אעטהום מיעאד ארבעין יום וכל הדא אל מודה ואברהם קאעד פי אל חבס
 ואעטו אל נאר בל חטב למא אנהא טלעת אל שעלולה לל גו אל אעלה
 וארסל נדה לל חבאס וקאל להו האת לי עדווי לאגל מא נרמיה פי הדחי
 אלרכיית אל נאר פי גה אל סגאן וסגר קודאם אל מלך וקאל להו כיף
 יאסיידי תטלוו מני ראגל מחבוס בקא להו סנה וכסור לא אכל ולא שורב
 פי קאל להו אל מלך רוח אל חבס ואנדה אן כאן יוונבך האתו ונרמיה פי
 14b אל נאר ואן כאן מאת אחסן אדפנו ולם ינדכר אסמו פי אל דונייא || פי אראח

אל סגנן לל חבס וסרך בצוטן עלי וקאל יא אברהם אנתה חי אוו מיית פי ואנבו אברהם וקאל להו אנה חי פי קאל להו אל סגנן מין אעטאך אכל ושוורב פי כול האדי אל מודה פי קאל להו רבי אעטאני אלדי הוא אלאה אלאהאט וסיד אלאסיאד ואלאה נמרוד ואלאה תרח ואלאה כול אל דונייה הוא אלדי יקות וימוון אלכול. נאצר ולא יתנצר והוא קאעד פי אל סמא אל אעלה² קאל פי חין מא סמע אל סגנן הדא אל כלאם אמן פי אלאה אברהם וקאל תחקיק אן אללה חק ואסמו חק ואנה אשהד כדאלך² פי חין מא קאל הדא אל קול וצל אל כבר אל נמרוד בקולת אן אל סגנן שהד עלא אלאה אב² אנהו חק פי אסתעגב אל מלך וארסל נדה אלא אל סגנן וקאל להו מאלך יא || סגנן כיף למא אנך כפרת פייה ושהדת עלא אלאה אברהם אנהו חק וכמאן אברהם עבדו חק קאל להו אל סגנן תחקיק לאנהו חק ואנתה כדאב כאפר מאפיש כלאם פי אתחמק אל מלך כלאם אל סגנן ואמר בקתלו פי חין מא גה אל משעלי לאגל מא יקתל אל סגנן סראך אל סגנן וקאל ה' הוא האלהים הוא אלאה כול אל דונייה ואלאנה² נמרוד אל כאפר² קאל אל מגיד אן אל סיף לס בקא יקטע פי רקבת אל סגנן וכול מא יגיבו סיף ינכצר למא אנכסר יומהא נחו ען מאייתין סיף פי אתעגב אל מלך וסייבו וארסל יגיב אברהם לאגל מא אנו ירמיה פי אל נאר וגאבו ואחד מן 15b אל כובאר פי אמרו אל מלך אנהו יחדפו || פי רכיית אל נאר פי אכרו אל ראגל לאגל אנו יחדפו פי אל נאר פי הגמת אל נאר עלא אל ראגל וחרקתו פי אמר גיר וגירו כדאלך אנחרק למא אנחרקו יומהא נחו ען מאיית אלף מן עסכר נמרוד ולם אחדן מנהום קדר יקארב עלא אל ראכיה פי אל חין גה אל שטן שבה בן אדם לענד אל מלך פי קאל להו אל מליך מאלך יאראגל פי קאל להו אנה גאי נשור עליך כיף תעמל למא אנך תרמי אברהם פי אל נאר האתלי כשב ואחבאל ואנה אעמל לך מגנאניק אלדי מן כותר זרפתו תרמיה פי וצט אל נאר מן בעיד ולם יתאסה עלא גנס אחדן פי אנכצט אד 16a מלך עלא הדא אל שורא ופרח ופרח עטים ואמר || בעמיל אלמגנאניק פי עמלו אל מגנאניק וקבל מא יגיבו אברהם גרבו פי חגאת וחטוהום גווא אל מגנאניק וחדפוהום גו פי אל נאר ואל מגנאניק הוא חטוה מעא עמודין ווקפין פי מטרח עאלי קוצאר ראכיה אל נאר וחבל עלא רקין מן הדא אל עמוד לל עמוד אל תאני ויגיבו אל אשייה יחטוהא בין אל חבלין ויברומו למא ינורד אל חבל עלא אל אשייה פי בעד מא ינורד אל חבל יסייבו אל אשייה תפרפר תחל גווא אל נאר פי אל חין גאבו אברהם וחטוה בין אל חבלין וכתפו דראעתו לוורא תכתיפה עטימה פי חין מא נצר רוחו פי האדהי אל צעאר² רפע עיניה אלא אל סמע אל אעלה וקאל. יארבי אדי אנתה נאצר אש ביעמל 16b פייה האדא אל רשע² וכמאן צרכית אל מלאיכה קודם אלק || סו' וקאלת יא ר"ש עולם נאציר אש ביעמל הדא אל רשע פי חביבך אברהם פי קאל

² צער Hebrew.

אל חק סו' כיף לס נערף ואנת עארף גמיע מא פי אל כפאייה לאכן דל
וקת אפרונכום אש נעמל פי הדא אל רשע נמרוד ואכלאץ חביבי אברהם.
קאל אל מגיד אן סעתהא גה אל שטן לענד אברהם בשבה בן אדם וקאל
להו יא אברהם אן כאן מוראדך תכליץ מן נאר נמרוד אסגד להו ואמן פיה
פי חין מא סמע אברהם כלאם אל שטן שכט פיה וקאל להו רוח יגער ה'
בך השטן רוח יא ארור מן הנה. פי פרג אל שטן מן קודאמו פי בעד דאלך
גאתת³ אום אברהם תבוס אבנהא ותתואדע מנו קבל מא ירמוה פי אל נאר
פיקאלת להו יא אבני אסגד לנמרוד ואמן פיה ואנתה תכליץ מן נארו קאל
17a להא יא אומי || רוחי עני חקאה מן עליה וקאל להא יא אומי די נאר נמרוד
אל מייה תטפיהא ואמא נאר אלאהי לס תנטפה אדא אנגמעו גמיע אל אבחור
לס יקדרו יטפו מנהא שראא פי גאובתו יא אבני אלאהך אלדי בתעבדו
הווא יכלצך מן נאר נמרוד פי אל חין קראטו עלא אברהם אל מנאניק לאנל
מא אנהום ירמוה פי אל נאר פי קאעת אל מלאיכה ושלבו עליה רחמים
מן אל חק סו' אנהו יכלצו מן נאר נמרוד פי אל חין גאלו אל מלאך גבראל
וקאל להו יא אברהם אכלצך מן נאר נמרוד פי קאל להו אברהם אלאהה
אלדי אנה מתעשם פיה הוא יכלצני פי חין מא נצר אל חק סו' אל כוונה בתע
אברהם אלתפת ברחמתהו וקאל לל נאר אהדי ואברדי ען עברי אברהם.
17b קאל אל מגיד אן פי אל חין ואל סאעה אנטפית אלנאר מן גיר || אומייה
וגמיע אל חטב אלדי כאן הנאך זהאר וזהר ושרח פאכהא כול גנס בגנסו אלי
כוך כוך ואלי תופאח תופאח למא בקא הינאך גנינה עטימה לס להא קד
ואלמלאכים קאעדין מעא אב' פ וצט אלגנינה פי אלתפת אלמלך ונצר
אברהם קאעד גווא אלגנינה ואל מלאכים קאעדין פי קאל להו אל מלך דא
אנתה סחאר כביר ומה יכפאש דאלך תווארי לל נאס אנאך קאעד פי גנינה
פי ואנבו גמיע אהל אל מגלס וקאלו חאשה הדא לס הוא שוּגל סחר אלא
אלאה כביר אלדי פעל דאלך ולם מווגוד אלאה אכור אלדי יקדר ליצנע
דאלך ואחנה נשהדו כדאלך אן אללה חק ואסמו חק ואברהם עברו נאמן
18a ביתו חק פי || קאמו גמיען כולהום בצוטן עאלי וקאלו ה' הוא האלהים ה'
הוא האלהים בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת אין עוד חי וקיים הוא מלא
רחמים הוא יתברך ויתעלה שמו לעד ולעולמי עולמים.
פי בעד מודת אייאם כובור סיידנא אברהם אבינו ע"ה פי רגע עליה
נמרוד יכפתו וינגרו וארסל גדה להו וחוצור קודאמו פי קאל להו אל נמרוד
יא אברהם טיעני ואמן בייה ואעבדני ואנה אנעלך אעטם אל וחאר ענדי ולא
יכון אחד אעלה ואשרף מנאך פי קאל להו אברהם יא נמרוד לא תסאלני
פי שאן דאלך דל חין לאן סרררי מתצאייק פי קאל להו נמרוד יא אברהם
ומא הו אלדי צאייק סררך קאל להו יא נמרוד כונת מן מודה נצרת ואחד
18b גריב אל בלאד למיתו פי ביתי ואל אן יריד אן יכון הווא || כביר אל בית

³ Third person perfect singular of *حآء* with double feminine ending.

ויתצלטאן עלייא ויריד יתכבר עלא גמיע אהל אל בית ולם אנה טאייקו ומתדייק מנו פי קאל להו נמרוד יא אברהם אל אן נרסל גערפֿו ונקול להו אן כאן יריר אל כובריייה ינשור להו מחיל ינשי מן מוקדֿרתו ויתצלטאן ויתכבר פֿיה ואמה לם ינבני אן יתכבר פי מחל גיר מחלו פי קאל להו אברהם יא נמרוד יסמעו אוודאנק מא קאל פֿומך תעלם אן הדא אל דונייה בתאע אל חק סו' אן כאן תריר תתכבר ותירד אל כלק תעבדך אעמל לך דונייה גיר דל דונייה ואתכבר ואתצלטאן פֿיהא לאן לא ינבני אן אלאה סו' סאייעך פי דונייאתו ואתה תתכבר אוכרוג מן דונייאתו ואתכבר פי קאל להו אנה לם 19a יכרוג מן ידי אן נעמל לי דונייה פי קאל להו אברהם חיס אן || לם יכרוג מן ידך תעמל דונייה כיף תרעיני נעבדך יא מגנון יא כאפֿר יא נאחד + פי סרך פי וטראדו ואראח מן קודאמו פי בעד מודת אייאם רגע אל נמרוד נדה לסייד אברהם וחצרו קודאמו וצאר נמרוד יכפחו ויגרו וקאל להו אלא תעבדני ותאמן בייה יא אברהם פי קאל להו אברהם גֿדה חתא אשאוור עקלי וקול לך אל חק תוים תאני יום ארסל אל מלך נמרוד חצאר אל סייד אברהם פי געל נפסו סיידנה אברהם מתגייר פי קאל להו נמרוד מאלך אראך אל יום מתגייר ען אל עאדה ואל גֿם טאהר עליך פי קאל להו יא נמרוד לם חסאל ען מא הוא חאצל לי אל אן פי קאל להו נמרוד אחכי לי יא אברהם 19b ואנה אסעפֿך פי קאל להו יא נמרוד לי בנת פֿארידה ולם להא || נשיר ואל אן וצעוהא עלא אל כורסי מן עשיית אמס לתאריכו לם וצעת ואל צגיר נצפו מראלי מנהא מן כארג ואל נצף מן דאכל והייא מתל אל מייתה פי קאל להו נמרוד יא אברהם אכתאר לך ואחדה מן אל אתנין אם תריר נקטאע אל צגיר ונויל מקטאע ואומו תעיש אם נשרוט בטן אומו ותמות וינויל אל צגיר טייב פי קאל להו הדא אל שור פֿאסד אנה נריר בנתי תכון טייבה ואל צגיר יכון טייב פי קאל להו נמרוד כיף יציר יא אברהם הדא אל כלאם קאל להו ארסל מן ענדר טלקה תכלאץ רוח מן רוח פי קאל להו יא אברהם והו אנה נחכום עלא אל טלק פי קאל להו אברהם חיס עלא טלקה לם תחכום כיף תריעיני נעבדך יא כאפֿר יא נאחד ולו כונת עאקל לם תקול אעבדני ואמן || 20a בייה + פי תראכו בעד מודת אייאם רגע עליה נמרוד יכפחו ויגרו וצאר יקול להו יג אברהם אעבדני ואמן בייה ולא תעציני ואנה נמויך בגמיע אל כיר תום קאל להו אברהם לגֿדה חתא אשור עקלי ונקול לך אל חק + בעד דאלך צבח תאני יום ארסל אל מלך נמרוד חצאר אברהם פי חאל מא דכל עליה פֿעל נפסו מכדר גאיית אלתכדיר פי קאל להו נמרוד יא אברהם מאלך אל יום אראך מכדר פקאל להו יא נמרוד לא חסאל במא חצל לי אל אן והו אן גמיע רזקי ומא אתחכים עליה פי מרכב ואל מרכב גאית⁴ לענד אל מינה ואל הווא וצארית מן לילת אמס לתאריכו ואנה שאייף רזקי ולם טאילוי וכאייף עלא אל מרכב לא יציבהא מציבה פי קאל להו נמרוד לא תכאף אל אן

⁴ See note 3.

20b נרסל לך || אכאם רגאל פי מראכב צוניירין אלדי אסמהום פלאייך ויגורו אל מרכב באחבאל חתא אן ידכלהא אל מינה באל סלאמה פי קאל להו אברהם יא נמרוד עלא אש הדא אל תעב כולו שוויית ריח מן ענדך ארסלהא תנפוך פי אל קלע תגיב אל מרכב באהוון סבב מן גיר תעב פי קאל להו יא אברהם לם אנה אחכום עלא אל ריח קאל להו אברהם יא נמרוד יא כאפר יא נאחד אל ריח לם תחכום עליה פי כיף תקול לי אעבדני פלא אעבד גיר רבי אלדי הוא קאדר עלא כול שיי וקאדר יחיי וימית ה' הוא האלהים סיד אל אסייאר ואלאה אל אלאהא אתה יא נמרוד כאפר נאחד תאכול כירו ותעבד גירו ולם תקדר תחכום חתא עלא רוחך ונדא תופנה 21a מן אל דונייא ומא באקי || אלא רב אל עאלמין חיי וקיים לעד - קאל אל אסייאר אן נמרוד מן עוטם מא כפר וטנה ומן עוטם כופרו וגוברו כאן עמל נפסו אלאה יעברו אל כלק לחין מא ארסל להו אל חק סו' אל בעוטה יעיני אל נמוסה אלדי הייא אצור אל כלוקה ואצעף אל אשייה ואמרהא אל חק סו' אנהא תסתנקם מן הדא אל כאפר פי דכלת אל נמוסה פי אנפו צעדת למוכו וצארת תאכול מן מוכו ולא תהדה לא ליל ולא נהאר ולם ערפו אל אטיבה אנהום יטייבו פי יום מן דאת אל אייאם דכל עליה אל שטן בצורית בני אדם יסלם עליה פי נטרו פי הדא אל עדאב על אלים פי קאל להו יא מלך אשור עליך שורה מסתחסנה ותרחת מן הדא אל עדאב אל אלים והו 21b אן תעמל ראס מן אל דהב אל צאפי ועייון מן אל גוואהר ותקטע || הדא אל ראס אלדי עליך תעבך ותווצע פי מחלהא אל ראס אל דהב פי מן עוטם תעבו מן ראסו מן אל בעוטה ופרוניית מוכו אסתחסן הדא אל שור חאלן אמר בעמל ראס מן אל דהב אל כאלץ ועייון מן אל גוואהר פי עמלו להו אל ראס ואמר חאלן באטע ראסו וקטעו ראסו והולוך ומאת ואנקטע מן אל דונייה פי פתחו ראסו ואכרנו מנהא הדא אל בעוטה פי וונדוהא קדר פרך אל חמאם אל צגיר וקד חונהא גה תוקלהא ארבעה ועשרין מתקל ברוך מאבד הרשעים ברנה אנשור ואעתבר יא אבן אדם קדר אש קודרת אל חק סו' יסייב לרשע וטוויל להו אל חבל וכול מא 22a יפעל דנוב יעטי להו קווה לאגל מא יכתרו דנובו ופי אכרתו יכליה יעץ || אל ארץ באסנאנו ויאכוד מן גיתחו אל קצאץ חוכם מא עראפנה ופהמנה אל חק סו' אלדי הלך אל גבאר נמרוד באצעף אל כלוקה סו' אל קאדר עלא כול שיי פי אסאלך יארבי אל רחמה ואל שפאקה בנאה אסמך אל מועטאם ובנאה חביבך ועזיך אל נבי אבונה אברהים אלכליל עאם.

AN EARLY THEOLOGICO-POLEMICAL WORK

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

THE religious and cultural fermentation in Oriental Jewry, viz. in Babylon and in Persia from the beginning of the 8th century and onwards, in consequence of, and in conjunction with, similar movements in the Muhammedan environment, is not yet known in its full significance and its manifold ramifications. There arose various sects and heterodoxies that disturbed, and even had a pronounced influence on, the course of normative rabbinic Judaism. As far as our information extends, beginning with the Messianic excitement, centered around Abū 'Īsa of Isphahān (who, according to Ḳirḳisānī,¹ lived in the time of the Umayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, 685–705), there was a breach within the ranks of the above Jewries. Talmudic Judaism, whose official spokesmen were the Babylonian Geonim and the leading members of their schools, was either partially rejected by some sectaries, or even entirely repudiated as in the case of 'Anan (about 760) and his adherents, subsequently known as the Ḳaraïtes.² As time went on, even Mosaic Judaism, as reflected in the Bible, was subjected to searching

¹ *Kitāb al-anwār wal-marākib*, ed. Harkavy, *Zapiski*, vol. VIII (St. Petersburg, 1894), p. 284, l. 6: וכאן טהורה פי איאם עבר אלמלך בן סרון. Friedlaender, *JQR.*, NS., I, 203 ff., accepts Shahrastānī's later dating of Abū 'Īsa, viz. that he started his agitation in the reign of the last Umayyad Caliph, Merwān II (744–50), and that he was killed by the troops of the second 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Manṣūr (754–75). But his arguments are not cogent at all. Ḳirḳisānī expressly enumerates after Abū 'Īsa his disciple Yudgān, and after the latter 'Anan who "was in the time of Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr" (l. c., l. 15: וכאן בעד יודגאן עאנאן ראם אלולות ודלך פי איאם אבי נעפר אלמנצור), which is more in accordance with the chronology since 'Anan's period of activity is well-established. Cp. also Poznafski, *Reshumot*, I, 209–10, who, too, rejects Friedlaender's dating.

² The sectarian movements of Abū 'Īsa and Yudgān petered out owing to their militant Messianic character, involving conflicts with the government troops. But 'Anan wisely refrained from such actions, and thus his schism, known as that of Ḳaraism, was able to make headway and to last. Cp. my remarks in *Hatteḳūfah*, XXIII, 250–51, and more will be said in another connection.

criticism. A characteristic figure in this latter respect was Hīwī al-Balkhī (about middle of 9th century),³ against whom Sa'adyah found it incumbent to enter the lists in defense of traditional Judaism. That there were Jews who in practice disregarded several important biblical laws, is evident from the famous Gaonic responsum dealing with "heretics who keep neither the Mišwot nor Sabbath; their mode of ritual slaughtering (of animals) is not like ours; they eat fat and (animal) blood and the 18 kinds of Terēfah (meat); they break the laws of prohibited marriages, use no Ketubot nor Giṭṭin, and they have no Ḥaliṣah nor Levirate marriage."⁴ Such a situation cannot be explained as mere wilful anti-nomianism. There must have been some underlying theoretical ideology on the part of these "Minim" in discarding such well-established Jewish practices, enjoined in the Bible, as the Sabbath, the abstention from animal fat and blood, the prohibition of illegitimate marriages, and the procedures of divorce, Yibbum and Ḥaliṣah. Probably the reasoning in justification of such flagrant law-breaking is to be found in the theory that the commandments of Judaism were obligatory only during the time when the Jewish people had its national statehood in Palestine; in the Diaspora they were no longer valid (see farther on). Of course, it may also be that the claims of the abrogation of the old dispensation by reason of new ones, such as Christianity and Islām respectively, had some influence on the notions of the above Jewish non-conformists.

³ This approximate date is to be derived from the statement of Kīrkisānī that Abū 'Imrān (=Moses) al-Tiflīsī wrote a reply to questions of Hīwī (*l. c.*, 315, ll. 21–22: *וְלֹא זִוְאָבָה מִסְאִיל יִסְבְּהָא אֱלִי חַיִּיהָ*); perhaps by these *מִסְאִיל* his notorious Book of (200) Questions is meant. Now the former flourished during and after the time of Isma'īl al-'Okbari and Benjamin al-Nihāwandi (*l. c.*, 285, ll. 8–9), and Isma'īl is placed in the reign of the 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Mu'taṣim, 833–42 (*l. c.*, 284, ll. 24–25). But Sa'adyah, in the second version of his *Sefer Haggaluy* (written in 933, as shown by me in *Tarbiṣ*, V, 165, note 59, and cp. 164), states that Hīwī's work, containing his 200 points in criticism of Bible and Judaism, circulated among the Jews already 60 years (*וְכַדְלָךְ אֶלְרֵד עָלֵי חַיִּי אֶלְבִּלְכִּי אֶלְדֵּי*: V, 177, ll. 12–14: *אֶקָּאם כְּחֻאבָה פִּי מָא בִּין אֶמְתָּנָא סְחִין סְנָה*). This would lead back to 873. However, this figure is rather relative. At any rate, some time must have elapsed before Hīwī's literary blast reached larger circles.

⁴ For the discussion of the respective data see Appendix (*infra*, pp. 454–59).

The unsettled religious state of affairs, both as to doctrine and practice, that obtained within Oriental Jewry, say, in the 8th–10th centuries, — a situation indicated here only in broad outline — is also reflected in the interesting work to be discussed here. Owing to the scattering of the Genizah fragments, portions of this book are being discovered in a spasmodic manner. In 1921 I published 4 leaves from the Taylor-Schechter collection at Cambridge which then appeared to me as a polemical tract against *Ḳaraite* and other sectaries (*JQR.*, *NS.*, XII, 123–150). As the leaves were separated, their proper sequence was not yet clear to me. Shortly afterwards, Marmorstein⁵ added 4 more leaves from the Adler collection, these being the outer ones of the former, so that there became available a continuous quire of 8 leaves. His printed text and his comments thereon leave much to be desired, and altogether his identification of the fragments as the introduction of the work on the Unity of God by David al-Muḳammaṣ cannot be accepted (cp. my remarks already in *JQR.*, *NS.*, XVI, 90, and see especially farther on, p. 417 f. and 432). Now two more leaves have turned up,⁶ of which the first is the direct continuation of the previous quire (see Text, fols. 8–9), whereas the second one reveals an extensive lacuna (see note 214 to Text). The scope and the tenor of the work are now much clearer, although there still remain obscurities. I deem it therefore proper to present herewith all the available material, carefully copied anew, with explanatory notes as well as the following introduction. Let us hope that still further portions will be made accessible in due course. As it is, the 10 leaves of *the same Ms.* emanate from three different Genizah collections: Cambridge, Adler, and Schechter!

The work under discussion has a long preface, the beginning of which is still missing, followed by several sections (מחברות). How many there were of the latter, is not known. So far we have

⁵ "Die Einleitung zu David b. Merwans Religionsphilosophie wiedergefunden" (*MGWJ.*, LXVI [1922], 48–64).

⁶ They belong to the private collection of the late Dr. Schechter, now at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. Prof. Alexander Marx kindly sent them to me for perusal, whereupon their sequence became forthwith clear to me. I am further obliged to him for making available to me the 4 leaves from the Adler collection in order to copy them anew.

the commencement of section I, dealing with the Unity of God (יחוד שם אלהינו, fol. 8b, l. 18 ff.); the end of section II treating of the duty of prayer (fol. 10a, ll. 1–16); and the beginning of section III (fol. 10a, l. 17 ff.), in which the author set forth to prove that the laws of Judaism applied also to the Diaspora and for all time. Section I consisted of 7 chapters (מחלקות, see note 190 to Text) of which only part of the first one is preserved, owing to the lacuna between fols. 9 and 10. This first chapter the author intended as the introduction to his whole work (fol. 9a, ll. 6–9), its topic being the evidence for a Divine Torah (revelation) and religion for all mankind, given to Israel but also meant to be adopted by all the other nations (fol. 9a, ll. 2–6).

Where the fragment commences (fol. 1a, ll. 1–5), citations from the Qurān are given, the last of which being Sura III (The Family of 'Imrān), 30 (see Text, notes 5–6).⁷ The author remarks that had he chosen to translate the whole Qurān and uncover its sources, its untenable statements would have become evident. It is to be regretted that he refrained from carrying out this project. Anyhow, he is to be added to the few early Jewish scholars who occupied themselves with this "Bible" of Islām in the original.⁸ These citations lead him to the general remark (l. 10 ff.)

⁷ It is curious to find how Marmorstein (*l. c.*, p. 49) misunderstood these Qurānic citations as emanating from a work of the sect whom our author was opposing! And since in l. 3 there is mentioned "the house of 'Amram," (viz. *ahl 'Imrān* in Sura III, 30, i. e., the family of 'Imrān, the father of Moses), he discovered therein (*ibid.*, p. 55) an allusion to the sect of "the 'Amramites" (sic)! He refers us to Pinsker, נספחים, לקוטי קדמוניות, p. 100, but there is only mentioned דת תפליסיים viz. the followers of Abū 'Imrān (= Moses) al-Tiflīsī (see above, note 3) which, of course, has nothing to do with עמרם here! See further Pinsker, pp. 11, 18, 26; נספחים, 84, note 1, who never calls them עמרמים ('Amramites). Cp. also *infra*, note 47.

⁸ See Steinschneider, *Polem. u. apolog. Liter.*, 313 ff. Interesting is the remark of Kırkisānī (*l. c.*, 300, top), in criticizing El'azar Qalir's reference to God's hand as being tied, that perhaps the statement in Qurān V (The Table), 69: "The Jews say: God's hand is chained up" emanated from this Paiṭan: וקד צרה בדרך אלעזר פי חזאנתה אלחי יצלון בהא יום אלכפורים פי לך ארץ ודריה; ודלך פי קולה. והיך הרמא אשר ברהט אסורה. ולעל אלדי קאל. וקאלת אליהוד יד אלה מגלולתה וקע לה הא אלקול פאכד מנה קולה. (In *HUCA*, VII, 355, the reference to Qurān V, 69, has not been recognized, and is also wrongly translated). That Kırkisānī (in 937) could offer such a suggestion, would indicate that he regarded Qalir as an early Paiṭan whose statements could

that all who acknowledge that there is a God, who revealed His law through a prophet, cannot do without "the holy Torah," except that they add to it or diminish from it, and invent items for the sake of fame. This he proceeds to illustrate by the cases of the Samaritans and the Christians, and subsequently he introduces the story of the supposed aid Muḥammad received in the composition of the Ḳurān from the ten Jewish elders.

As to the Samaritans (fol. 1a, l. 14-3a, l. 13), it is of interest to find our author endeavoring to advance reasons why they were not accepted as a part of the Jewish people, although they requested to have a share in the building of the second Temple (Ezra 4.2). When R. Ishmael and R. 'Aqiba discussed the status of the Samaritans, with the latter arguing that they were "true proselytes" (גרי אמת, see Text, note 41), one wonders how he justified their exclusion by Zerubbabel, Yeshu'a and the other leaders (Ezra 4.3), at least from the legal point of view favoring the admittance of genuine newcomers to Judaism. In Mas. Kutim, end,⁹ the law is already crystallized forbidding the acceptance of

be known to the Jews of Yathrib (Madīnah) and thus reach the ears of Muḥammad during his stay there (from 622 to 632).

Underlying Ḳalir's phraseology אשר ברהט אסורה is perhaps the Aggadic comment on Cant. 7.6 (מלך אסור ברהטים) that God took an oath that His Shekinah would reside under the rafters of Jacob (viz. the Temple): אסור ברהטים, שאסר עצמו בשבועה שהוא משרה שכינתו בתוך ישראל ברהטים של יעקב (Cant. r., a. l., cp. Lev. r., c. 31.4). Indeed Ḳirḳ. cites Cant. 7.6 before quoting Ḳalir (there is a lacuna in the text), apparently meaning this Aggadah which he held up to scorn (as is the tenor of his whole chapter there). Yet from Hadassi, *Eshkol*, Alph. 81, letter 'ק', it would seem that some other Aggadah is involved: קשור ואסור במחשכים שנ' מלך אסור ברהטים, וידו אסורה וקשורה ואינו יכול לשלחה להושיע לעמו, כאשר פייט ר' אליעזר (צ"ל אלעזר) קליר, והיד הרמה אשר ברהט כשמתפללים: (Cp. further Alph. 364 (fol. 136a, l. 17 ff.).) נחמא, והיד הרמה אשר ברהט אסורה ומלך מליתו כשל מווצח' וכו' (The references in Hadassi are already listed by Zunz, *Litgesch. d. synag. Poesie*, 63, No. 26.)

⁹ שבע מסכתות קטנות ירושלמיות, ed. Kirchheim, p. 36; ed. Higger, p. 66: מפני מה הכתובים אסורין לבא בישראל, מפני שנתערבו עם כהני הבמות. רבי ישמעאל אומר גירי צדק היו מתחילתן, ומפני מה אסורין, מפני ספק ממזרות, ושאינו מיבמין את הנשואה. For R. Ishmael read R. 'Aqiba as it is evident from Ḳidd. 75b, bottom, and especially from Yer. Giṭṭin I (43c, bottom): כותים משום מה הם פסולין (43c, bottom): אילו מי שלא נתגייר לשום (היינו לבוא בקהל ישראל), אמר ר' יוחנן משום גירי אריות. וקשיא: אילו מי שלא נתגייר לשום שמים והור ונתגייר לשום שמים שמה אין מקבלין אותו, ר' יוחנן בשם ר' אלעזר משום גוי ועבד הבא על בת ישראל הוולד ממזר. והאמר ר' עקיבה גירי צדק הן, על שם שהן מייבמין את

Samaritans, either because originally they received instruction from illegal priests (this is also one of the reasons stated by our author) or, although at first they were "true proselytes," their marital relationships involved illegitimacy of offspring. But this represents already a formulation dating much later than the above two Tannaim. Mas. Kutim concludes with the conditions governing their admission, viz. denial of Mount Gerizim (i. e. abandonment of sacrifices there), belief in Jerusalem (viz. to turn one's face towards the site of the Temple while at prayer) and in the doctrine of resurrection.¹⁰ Actual cases of such conversions are difficult to cite. The passage in *Pirke di R. Eli'ezer*, c. 38, end (see Text, note 29), refers to an "everlasting Herem" forbidding the acceptance of Samaritans, thus reflecting the long-standing enmity that separated the former from the rest of the Jewish people.

To return now to the reasons advanced by our author. 1) As the Samaritans were not of Jewish stock, the Jewish leaders, foreseeing the second exile from Palestine, feared lest the Temple and the land remain in the former's hands with the result that there would be confusion as to who constituted the Jewish people, whether these Samaritans or the Jews in exile. 2) They retained their idolatrous practices along with their acceptance of the God of Israel. 3) The priest that instructed them in Judaism was a descendant of Jeroboam's priests who did not belong to the tribe of Levi ("the priests of the high places"). Whatever the cogency of these reasons concerning the past, the author admits in respect to his own time that the Samaritans were fully observing the laws of the Pentateuch (see Text, note 45). He mentions their argument in rejecting the rest of the Bible because of Deut. 13.1.¹¹

הארוסות ומוציאין את הנשואות. והא רבנין אמרין אין ממזר ביבמה, על שם שאינו בקיין בדיקדוקי נישין. הא רבן גמליאל מכשיר בנישיתן, ר' יעקב בר אידי בשם ר' יוחנן על שנחזקו בהם כהני כמזר. Cp. further *Yer. Yeb. VII* (8b, bottom), *Ket. III* (27a, bottom). It is clear that the item in Mas. Kutim is formulated on the basis of this discussion in *Yer.*, hence their status of ממזרות is declared to be only "doubtful" (ספק).

¹⁰ מאימתי מקבלין אותם, משיכפרו בהר גריזים ויורו בירושלים ובתחיית המתים.

¹¹ Cp. also *Shahrastānī* (transl. Haarbrücker, I, 258): "They accepted as prophets Moses, Aaron and Joshua b. Nun, but rejected all subsequent prophets, except the one who, as predicted in the Torah, would come after Moses; this one will confirm the extant Torah, decide according to its opinion

They further regard themselves as the children of Israel, notwithstanding their small minority, since according to Deut. 7.7 God's choice fell upon "the fewest of all peoples." It is the latter assumption that our author particularly opposes, arguing that this verse applies only to the Jews, who became scattered among the nations to serve in the rôle of a kingdom of priests to them, and who will be gathered together in due course. The Samaritans, however, have never been seen outside Palestine—a remark that is not in accordance with the facts, but which tends to show that the author lived either in Babylon or in Persia, and thus knew of their whereabouts as being only "in the land of the Philistines" (see Text, note 60).

Next the rise of Christianity is reviewed from the polemical angle (fol. 3a, l. 13-4a, l. 18). Unlike the Kutim, who only adopted Judaism on account of the lions that wrought destruction among them, the "Nazarenes," he argues, honestly desired to join Judaism, but were misled by their spiritual guides into claiming that they were "the new Israel," possessing "the new Torah and the new covenant," endowed with "the new heart" and worthy of "the new heaven and earth," as foretold by the prophets. The author has some unflattering allusions to the founder of Christianity, and also sarcastically describes the churches with their ikons and paintings depicting his life-story from his conception in the womb to his end. What interests us here, is the author's attempt at showing the deception employed in proving the doctrine of Trinity from the Bible. About Israel it is said: "Ye are the children of the Lord your God" (Deut. 14.1), and also: "Israel is My son, My firstborn" (Ex. 4.22). This applies to Jesus as one of the Jews. Now "every son has a father, the father of Israel being in heaven." Further, the spirits of Israel are in heaven (in accordance with Isa. 48.16). Thus Jesus was called: "Father, Son and Holy Spirit." This is a crude formulation of the doctrine of Trinity (see Text, note 75). It disposes at once of Marmorstein's identification of the author with David b. Merwān al-Muḡammaṣ (or Miḡmāṣ, *l. c.*, 56-57). This remark-

and in no wise depart from it." The references to this future prophet are taken from Deut. 18.15 and 18. He is to be the so-called Ta'eb (Messiah) of the Samaritans (cp. also Gaster, *The Samaritans*, 90-91).

able man was, for a number of years, a converted Christian while studying in Nisibis under a renowned Christian teacher, Nānā (Nonnus). He acquired a thorough knowledge of Christian dogmatics and also of philosophy. Later on, upon returning to Judaism, he wrote two works against his erewhile religion.¹² Kīrkisānī's knowledge of Christianity was apparently derived from him. One has only to compare the former's explanation of the Trinity (*l. c.*, p. 305, ll. 20–26, cp. *HUCA*, VII, 365)¹³ with the above statement that *Jesus was called* "Father, Son and Holy Spirit" in order to realize that its author was not the well-informed David ibn Merwān.¹⁴ Also Sa'adyah treats of this doctrine in an expert manner.¹⁵ Of special interest here is Sa'adyah's enumeration of the four groups in Christianity differing on the conception of the nature of Jesus. The last group is, according to him, of recent origin. It maintains that Jesus as "Son" is meant only as a prophet, the term being used merely to indicate greatness and distinction, just as Israel is called "My first-born son" (Ex. 4.22).¹⁶ Our author also cites this verse in connection with his description of the deception employed in the formulation of the theory of Trinity. But his familiarity with the subject is rather deficient

¹² See Kīrkisānī, *l. c.*, p. 306, and cp. *HUCA*, VII, 366.

¹³ Cp. also Hadassi, cited in Text, note 75.

¹⁴ As to his work on the Unity of God, which was in Arabic and not in Hebrew, see farther on (p. 432).

¹⁵ See *Emunot we-De'ot*, II, 5–7 (ed. Slucki, 45 ff.): ואחר כך אומר שבשער הזה טעו הנוצרים וחשבו בו זולתו, והביאם זה אל שישימוהו שלשה ויצאו אל הכפירה. והנה אני מקיים [מה] שיש עליהם מהתשובה מהמושכל, ובאחד, האמת[ות] (אלחסיקין' במקור הערבי) באחדותו, אעור. ואיני מכיין בתשובה הזאת עמי הארץ שבהם, כי הם אינם יודעים כי אם השלוש המונשם בלבד, ולא אשריד ספרי בתשובתם מפני שהוא מבואר וקל. אבל אכיון להשיב אל חכמיהם, אשר חושבים שהם מאמינים בשלושה בעיון ובדקות תבונה, וכו'. See his remarks about the supposed biblical proofs for the Holy Spirit (p. 46). For the exposition of Sa'adyah's refutation of the concept of the Trinity cp. Kaufmann, *Attributenlehre*, 38 ff., and Guttman, *Religionsphilos. des Saadia*, 103 ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47: ואלה האנשים, ירחקו האל, ארבע כחות. השלש מהם יותר קדמונים, וסוברים בן הרביעית מקרוב יצאה. . . . אבל הרביעית חושבת שהוא כמו הנביאים בלבד, וסוברים בן הנוצר אצלם בו, כאשר נסבור אנחנו בבני בכורי ישראל כי הוא להגדיל ולפאר בלבד, וכו'. See about this passage Kaufmann, *l. c.*, 48–52, and Guttman, *l. c.*, 108–12. Cp. further the fragment, apparently from Sa'adyah's *Kitāb al-Tamyīz* (*JQR*, XIII, 657, ll. 12–14), where the four divisions in Christendom are also mentioned (ואלך יקול הו כאחד אלנוביא). The identity of this fourth group is still subject to doubt, but the matter cannot be discussed here.

and his notion vague. Apparently he was more interested in his polemical purpose than in accuracy. Yet it should be added that Judah Halleḇi (Kuzari, I, 4) has a similar vague formulation.^{16a}

Having cited the examples of the Samaritans and of Christianity, the author seems to turn (fol. 4b, l. 1 ff.) against certain contemporary Jews, "our brethren, our rebels, defiers and despisers, who strike at the inheritance which our God gave us." In his flow of denunciation he interrupts his sentences (see Text, note 102) in order to express a wish that these Jews had acted as the supposed 10 elders who helped Muḥammad in the composition of the Ḳurān (fol. 4b, l. 13-5a, l. 7). This episode will be discussed now first in order subsequently to deal in a connected form with the criticism of the theories of the contemporaries whom the author had in mind.

The account, as given in our text, has a fuller parallel in the Judeo-Arabic "Story of Muḥammad's (Jewish) Contemporaries" (קצת אצחאב מחמר) published by Leveen.¹⁷ This is designated as an Appendix to a "Book of Chronology" (כתאב אלתאריך). Whose work the latter was, is not stated. Sa'adyah is the author of a treatise by the same title,¹⁸ but no doubt there were other Jewish writers of chronologies. Even if Sa'adyah's work is meant here, there are no means of ascertaining whether he also composed this appendix. Be this as it may, the story of the supposed collaboration of 10 Jewish elders in the composition of the Ḳurān was evidently widely current in Jewish circles.¹⁹ Of their names, four

^{16a} Ed. Hirschfeld, p. 10, ll. 6-7: והו אלמסיה אלמסמי ענדנא באבן אללה, והו אלמאב והו אלמאבן והו רוח אלקדס.

¹⁷ *JQR*, NS., XVI, 399-406; cp. also XVII, 235-6, 237, and 485. The Byzantine chronicler, Theophanes Confessor (died 817), also refers to the ten Jewish notables who joined Muḥammad (see the German tr. of the passage in Dieterich, *Byz. Quellen z. Länder- u. Völkerkunde*, I, 88). Schwabe (*Tarbiḡ*, II, 74 ff.), in his study of Theophanes' report, also considers the above two parallel texts.

¹⁸ See Marx, *RÉJ.*, LVIII, 299-300, and cp. Malter, *Saadia Gaon*, 172-73, 353-54.

¹⁹ Attention should also be drawn to a passage in the commentary to Deut. by the famous Karaite scholar of Jerusalem (1st half of the 11th century), Abū'l Faraj Furkān b. Asad (Yeshu'ah b. Yehudah, MS. Firkowicz, 2. Hebrew-Arab. Collection, No. 2086 containing 88 leaves): וקד קיל אן

are given in our fragment, viz. Ka'b al-Aḥbār, 'Abd Allāh b. Salām, 'Omar the Witness,²⁰ and Yoḥanan called "He that was routed into the garden." In the Judeo-Arabic account seven additional persons are mentioned, thus making a sum total of 11, but probably the last two items refer to one and the same person.²¹ The historicity of these 10 elders is subject to much doubt, and still more their dealings with the prophet. Only the first two are more or less known, viz. Ka'b al-Aḥbār and 'Abd Allāh b. Salām, and only the latter is supposed to have joined Islām immediately after Muḥammad's arrival in Madīnah (622), whereas the former became a Muslim only some time after 632, the year when the prophet died.²² These elders are stated to have composed the Qurān, each inserting his name in a Sura in such a manner as not to arouse suspicion.²³ In the 2nd Sura (the Cow) they even man-

אלמרדא בקולה אובד עצות (דברים ל"ב, כ"ח) הי עצות אצחאב אלאגיל ועצות העשרה אשר יאמרו כי הם תקנו הספר הזה האחד. וכאן פי דאך הלאך ישראל.

²⁰ עומר אלשהיד, in *JQR.*, NS., XVI, 402: As suggested by me *ibid.*, XII, 130-31, he is to be identified with Abū 'Umar ibn Tayyāhān, a Syrian Jew living in Medina, who is supposed to have foretold Muḥammad's functions as a prophet (cp. Sprenger, *Das Leben u. die Lehre des Mohammed*, I, 55, note 1).

²¹ *JQR.*, NS., XVI, 402: עשאל הנקרא כִּתָּן אלנבי חפץ אבי צפיה נאריה אלנבי; thus 'Ashael, called the prophet's father-in-law, is identical with Ḥefes, the father of Ṣafiyah, the Jewish wife of Muḥammad. (Gandz's translation of חפץ as "guardian", *ibid.*, XVII, 235, is certainly incorrect, see Leveen, *ibid.*, p. 485.) However, Ṣafiyah's father is usually called Ḥuyayy (see Sprenger, *l. c.*, III, 78-9, and *Enc. of Islam*, s. v. Ṣafīya). This name is probably a corruption of Ḥunai (Ḥoni), as Ṣafiyah's father is called in the interesting Genizah fragment (*JQR.*, XV, 177, cp. 169, note 1): חני בן אכטב בן חנינא. He is known as a political opponent of Muḥammad and died as a good Jew. In view of this consideration, in the above text for אבי probably א כ י should be read, thus 'Ashael was the prophet's brother-in-law, viz. Ṣafiyah's brother bearing also the name of Ḥefes.

²² See about them *Enc. of Islam*, s. v. Cp. also about 'Abdallāh, *JQR.*, X, 110 ff.

²³ In our Text (fol. 5a, ll. 2-4) vaguely: אשר באו אליו ועשו לו אות הקלון: וכתבו והרכיבו שמום כל אחד ואחד וקראן, see *JQR.*, NS., XII, 140, note 63). In the Judeo-Arabic account (*l. c.*, XVI, 402) there is a double description. First: והנדרון לה: אמרה, דכרו לה אליה, ורכבו וכתבו פי אול סורה מן קראנה אסמהם כה' (= כתאבא, see XVII, 235, bottom, ורכבו וכתבו כ' י' ע' צ' ח' כ' מ' י' ש' ד' א' ל' ל' ה' ש' ע', וכו).

aged to introduce a sentence: ככה (כך) יעצו חכמי ישראל לאלם הרשע; "thus did the Jewish sages counsel the wicked אלם"; the last word may be taken as a reference to a false prophet.²⁴ In the Judeo-Arabic account there is given a string of verses, supposedly to be found in this Sura, the first letters of which make up the above sentence.²⁵ However, we seek in vain for them in the present text of Sura II. The only connection may be found in the symbolic letters *A L M* at the beginning of this Sura (as well as of several others) which would stand for אלם in the above sense.²⁶ But altogether this stratagem, which our author designates as "a great secret" (see Text, note 14), cannot of course be given any credence. The acceptance of Islām by these 10 elders is supposed to have been for "the purpose of saving God's people so that he (Muḥammad) should not harm them by his false charges."²⁷ But this is belied by his attacks on the Jews, as voiced in the Qurān, and by his actions against the Jews of Madīnah and Ḥaibar. Thus the whole episode lacks a real historical basis; it is rather a later legend. The convert to Islām (in 1163), Samuel ibn Yaḥya al-Maghribī, also mentions the gossip of his former co-religionists as to how 'Abd Allāh b. Salām tried to befuddle Muḥammad when imparting to him some knowledge of the Torah.²⁸ There is also a peculiar story of the relations of a certain

הם אלי' אלדין נאו אליה ואסלמו עלי ידיה לילא יציב ישראל שי, ועמלו לה; קראן, וכחבו ורכבו אסטאחם כל ואחד פי סורה מן ניר מוקע לאלאסדא. וכחבו פי סורה אלוסטי כ'ך' וכו'. The second passage corresponds more closely to the above text with its continuation (fol. 5a, ll. 4-5): ככה (= בסורה) הפרה: ככה יעצו וכו'.

²⁴ Cp. Isa. 56.10: צפיו עורים כלם לא ידעו כלם כלבים אלמים לא יוכלו לנבח; Yet one could vocalize לאַלם, the violent (person), or לאַלם, to silence (the wicked one).

²⁵ *JQR.*, NS., XVI, 402-03.

²⁶ Rivlin (see *Tarbiz*, II, 81) attempted to reconstruct this sentence כך כן from these symbolic letters at the headings of several Suras, but both accounts refer to this sentence as an insertion into Sura II (the Cow).

²⁷ Text, fol. 5a, ll. 6-7; in the Judeo-Arabic account: לילא יציב ישראל שי, "lest he harm Israel in any way."

²⁸ See Schreiner's description of Samuel's 'Iḥām al-Yahūd' (*MGWJ.*, XLII, 221-22), and cp. also *JQR.*, NS., XII, 126-7. See further the refutation of Samuel's charges in the interesting passage published by Neubauer, *REJ.*, V, 52-54, and cp. also *JQR.*, NS., XVI, 90-91.

Abū Bakr (perhaps a confusion with the first Caliph Abū Bakr), the son of the (Babylonian?) Exilarch, with the prophet. Banished to Persia, this Abū Bakr converted the inhabitants of 60 cities to Islām.²⁹ All such stories are apparently the reflection of a vague notion current in Jewish circles concerning the Jewish share in the evolution of the new religion and the personal contacts of some Arabian Jews with its founder.

After this digression concerning the *Qurān*, the author returns (fol. 5a, l. 8 ff.) to voice his resentment against his Jewish contemporaries (see above, p. 419) who "separate themselves" from God's Torah. These he styles farther on "Jewish separatists" (מובדלי בני ישראל) who are not identical with the *Ḳaraites*, mentioned by him separately as "Minim" (see Text, notes 102 and 198). Here we have a term closely resembling that of *Mu'tazila* (מעחולה) by which the Muslim rationalistic theologians were called (cp. מובדלי בני ישמעאל in fol. 5a, l. 14). This group is accused of eclecticism as follows (fol. 5a, l. 12–5b, l. 2): "For they said: We have concluded a covenant with the separatists of the children of Ishmael (i. e. Muslim *Mu'tazila*) as regards the beginning of the month and other matters; with Edom (i. e. Christianity) we made a treaty concerning 'And ye count from the morrow of the Sabbath' (Lev. 23.15, i. e. Pentecost always falling on a Sunday); the lie of the Kutim (Samaritans) we have made our refuge concerning 'Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations (upon the Sabbath day,' Ex. 35.3); and we hid ourselves in the falsehoods of the Brahmans (Barāhima) who say about God's commandments, both those that should be done and those that

²⁹ See Jacob b. Elijah's polemical tract against Pablo Christiani (Kobak's כתוב בספר הימים למחומט הרמאי, שותפו של אשמדאי, ישרון, VI [1868], pp. 13–15): "זה אבו בכר כאשר אבו בכר הכה חייא הנוצרי מכת אכורי, מחומט לארץ פרס שלחו . . . זה אבו בכר היה בנו של ראש הגולה, וכאשר ראה מחומט ומעלחו אשר עלה, פחד פן ישפילנו ממעלתו, ויורידנו מגדולתו, ופשט בגדיו הנקיים ולבש בגדים צואים (היינו: שנחאסלים), ולקח תרבות אנשים חטאים, ויהי אחד מחבריו, וישמע למאמרו . . . וישלחו אל ארץ פרס, ושם פנות תורתו (היינו: תורת ישראל) הרס, ולמצוא חן בעיני מחומט השיב ששים ערים לתורתו, ושמרו את מצותו . . . זהו אבו בכר שמו ימח אשר השקיע ששים ערים בארץ פרס ואילו דורשים, לחת להם אמונה בויהי וגרועה, והוציאם מרעה אל רעה, ומאס את ברית אלהיו ואת . . . רשעים ירקב וכו'". (Steinschneider's comment on this passage, *Polem. u. Apolog. Lit.*, 416, hardly satisfies). For an historical analysis of this tract, see Mann, *REJ.*, LXXXII, 363–77.

ducees, or rather their section known as the Boethusians, insisted on the literal interpretation of Lev. 23.15 concerning the date of offering up the 'Omer, thus resulting in Shabu'ot always falling on a Sunday seven weeks subsequently. On the other hand, the charge of following the Samaritans in the strict interpretation of Ex. 35.3 allowing no fire or light of any kind on the Sabbath, even if burning from before, is correct.³² As regards these two items the group, which our author had in mind, again shared in common with the Karaites, except that among certain sections of the latter there was a difference of opinion as to which Sunday should be Shabu'ot.³³

The fourth charge concerns the acceptance of the views of the Barāhima. According to Shahrastānī (tr. Haarbrücker, II, 356–57), their founder, Barhām, completely negated prophecy and tried to prove its rational impossibility. This involved the rejection of many traditional laws as contrary to reason. Sa'adyah too had to combat this view which maintained that mankind had no need of prophecy.³⁴ Here the Gaon does not seem to refer to

³² Cp. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, III, 287–289; Wreschner, *Samarit. Traditionen*, 15 ff.

³³ Thus Meswi al-'Okbari and Karaites in Baṣrah (see Qirkisānī, *l. c.*, 316, ll. 3–5, 318, ll. 33–35, cp. *HUCA.*, VII, 390, top, 395). This is also repeated by Hadasi, *אשכל הכפר*, Alph. 98, letter נ' (fol. 42a, top): נאם גם הוא: כי חג שבועות ביום ראשון לעולם, אלא אינו יודע אי זה יום ראשון. וזו הדת גם היא לאנשים מבצרה. The actual point involved is not clear, except that Meswi may have been in doubt whether Shabu'ot fell on the Sunday which was the 50th day since the 'Omer (cp. Lev. 23.16) or on the following Sunday.

³⁴ *Emunot we-De'ot*, III, 3 (ed. Slucki, p. 61): וכיון שאמרתי זה הכלל בשני: ראוי שאבאר מה היה הצורך לשלוחים ולנביאים, כי חלקי המצות, והם השכליות והשמעיות, ראוי שבאדם צורך לנביאים, ושכליהם מספיקים להם שמעתי כי יש אנשים שאומרים כי אין לבני אדם צורך לנביאים, ושאכל בשר וחלב, ושנחרש בשור וחמור. להישרם במה שיש בהם מן הטוב ומן הרע, וכו'. (About this passage see Guttman, *l. c.*, 139 ff.) Cp. further III, 10 (p. 71): וראיתי מהם מי שאומר אם יאמרו לכם: הברהמים אנונו קבלנו מאדם הראשון שנלבש שעמנו, ושנאכל בשר וחלב, ושנחרש בשור וחמור ויחדיו, ואין לכם לקבל דברי נביא שאמרם כי אדם אמר לנו שלא יבטלו וכו'. See also Abū'l Faraj Furkān, *ס' העריות המכונה ס' הישר*, ed. Markon, p. 12: המכחשים לבורא העולם, ובלבד מי שיבטל הנבואה, ואם אמר כי יש אלוה, ויאמר כי לא יכשר אשכל. לעולם (אולי צ"ל: לבורא עולם) שיבוא נביא אל בני אדם קול נתנו עוד בני דת אלבריהמי באמרם אל אחד: (אלפ. 96, letter ק' (fol. 41a): הכפר מיוחד ואין דומה לו בכל בריה קצובה וחרוטה, אבל שקר נביאיו וחזיון לא דבר האלהים עם בשר ואדם, כי איך ידבר אלהים, אשר הוא נורא ופלא, (צריך להוסיף: עם בן אדם) בעולמו: Further Aaron b. Elijah, *עץ חיים*, c. 96, (ed. Delitzsch, p. 160):

Jews who followed this opinion, but in our fragment we find direct evidence that certain Jews negated prophecy and hence regarded the laws as "stored up in the hearts of human beings till their time arrived" (viz. they are evolved from human intellect in accordance with the demands of the times). Naturally this resulted in the justification for breaking many a Jewish traditional law. Our author goes on to polemize against this theory by emphasizing the great act of the revelation on Sinai. The Torah was given to be observed by the Jews and to be taught by them to the other nations, "not to be stored up in the recesses of the hearts and in the innermost of the kidneys, but to be kept and practiced by mouth, heart, and all the senses" (fol. 5b, l. 14 ff.). Perhaps the sarcastic reference to "the recesses of the heart and the innermost of the kidneys" is to a subdivision of the *Barāhima*, viz. the *Baḳrantīniya* who (according to *Shahrastānī*, *ibid.*, p. 361) would bind their body, from the waist to the breast, with iron in order that their bodies should not burst from the abundance of knowledge, the power of imagination and the force of thought.

Our author further strongly insists that only "the congregation of Jacob" was the recipient of the Torah (revelation), not Noah, not Ishmael and not Esau (fol. 6a, l. 9 ff.). He gives a lengthy interpretation of Isa. 48.12-16 to emphasize that the name Jacob-Israel antedates even the creation of the world (fol. 6b, l. 13 ff.). To Jacob's descendants has an everlasting covenant been given, never to be changed or abrogated. All this seems to be directed against Muhammedan claims that the Law already began with Noah. Thus *Shahrastānī* writes (*ibid.*, I, 35-36): "The Law had its commencement with Noah, as it is said in God's words: 'To you hath He prescribed the faith which He commanded unto Noah' (Sura 42.11); and the legal ordinances and prescriptions began with Adam, Shet and Idrīs (Enoch)."³⁵

הדעת השנית היא דעת אל בראהמה ואל דהריה חכמי הודו, שמאמינים במציאות אלה ואמונת ההשגחה הפרטית בנמול ועונש, ואינם מאמינים בנבואה. אמנם אומרים; שהשם אינו נוף, ומי שאינו נוף איך ידבר עם נוף. והיתה מניעתם זאת כי לא ידבר אלהים את האדם וחיי. וכו' (cp. also *ibid.*, p. 307, s. v. בראהמה).

³⁵ About this problem, as discussed by *Ḳaraite* writers, see the passage from Tobias b. Moses' *Oṣar Neḥmad* (published by Mann, *JQR.*, NS., XV, 375, and cp. *ibid.*, pp. 362 and 364-5).

Muḥammad's claim was that revelation was continued to Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and finally to him as the completion of prophecy. How far this involved the group our author had in mind, is difficult to say, since it neglected prophecy altogether. But in a general way he seems to combat the idea of recognizing the respective missions of Jesus and Muḥammad. According to Ẹırķisānī (*l. c.*, 312, l. 5 ff.), Abū 'Isa of Isphahān acknowledged the prophecy of both, contending that each of them was sent (by God) to his respective people. He even directed his followers to read the Gospels as well as the Ẹurān and to familiarize themselves with the commentaries on them. Ẹaraītes in Tustar (Shuster, in Persia) agreed with this view to a certain extent.³⁶ Due to the eclecticism of the group opposed by our author, similar theories may have been current among its members too.

The preface ends with a tirade against these people who readily forgot God's deeds towards Israel and wilfully separated themselves from the Jewish community (fol. 8a, l. 13 ff.), preferring to follow the views of "*Abū Hāshim and Jubbai and their companions*" (fol. 8b, ll. 3-4) rather than God's words as announced by the prophets. Here we have a sole chronological clue which leads us to the 10th century. Abū 'Alī Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Jubbai (viz. from Jubbā in Khuzistān) is known as a prominent leader of the Mu'tazila in Baṣrah (he died in 915/16). His son, Abū Hāshim 'Abd al-Salām (died in 933), also figures among these liberal theologians. The father declared, among other views, the attributes of God as identical with His essence, thus really denying the existence of the former, but the son tried to modify this doctrine, so as to appease the orthodox Muslim theologians, by declaring the attributes as accidents (*aḥwāl*).³⁷ But our author is very vague in indicating the manner in which the people he had in mind accepted the views of al-Jubbai and his son, Abū Hāshim. Among the Ẹaraītes Joseph al-Baṣīr followed this school of thought.³⁸ The group attacked,

³⁶ See Friedlaender, *JQR.*, NS., III, 240-43.

³⁷ See *Enc. of Islam*, s. v. al-Jubbai, and, more fully, Shahrastānī, tr. Haarbrücker, I, 80-88.

³⁸ See Frankl, *Beiträge zur Literaturgesch. d. Karäer* (Berlin 1887), 7-8.

seems to have also indulged in certain Messianic calculations which turned out awry (see Text, notes 178, 181, 183).

Herewith ends the long preface. There follows the first section of the work, divided into 7 chapters of which only a fragment of the first one is preserved (see above, p. 413 f.). Section I deals with the Unity of God; and chapter 1, designed as the introduction to the whole work, is to prove that "all kinds of human beings, who acknowledge God," should have a Torah (revelation) and a law, both written and oral, viz. the ones given to Israel but also meant for all the other nations (fol. 9a, l. 1 ff.). Interesting is the enumeration of the aims of the author. One is to satisfy Rabbanite intellectual Jews who desire to know this doctrine from the several aspects as looked upon by various peoples in every generation. Another is to forestall specious arguments gathered by some learned Jews from the writings of other nations. A third aim is to refute the "Jewish separatists," in accordance with the Rabbinic dictum: "learn diligently what to answer the Epicurean"; and likewise to refute the "Minim who call themselves *Ḳaraïtes*." Still a fourth aim is directed against the ultra-orthodox Rabbanite school teachers who shun rationalistic investigation of religion and Torah for fear of being led astray into heresy. Against the latter the author argues that the Torah was meant to constitute Israel's "wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations," thereby deserving to be called "a wise and understanding people" (cp. Deut. 4.6). This eulogy of the Torah is not to be found in such narrative parts as the enumeration of Ishmael's descendants (citing Gen. 25.14), but in its "righteous statutes and ordinances." The author sarcastically goes on to score a point against these school teachers who impart to their pupils merely a reading knowledge of the Bible, to be recited in a sing-song, without a deeper understanding of its contents. We thus find him an advocate of rationalism in matters of Judaism, although being a staunch defender of traditionalism. Sa'adyah too had to defend the employment of reason, albeit conserva-

Al-Jubbaï (Abū 'Alī) is also cited by Abul Faraj Furkān (see Schreiner, *Studien über Jeschua b. Jehuda*, 83-4, and XIII = ישור' המכונה ס' העריות ed. Markon, 15, bottom).

of the Israelites (hence not in the Diaspora).⁴² For all we know, Meswi al-'Okbari, who is accused of permitting his followers the breaking of many laws,⁴³ may have also followed the theory of non-validity of a part of Judaism in Galut. And the "Minim" in the time of R. Naṭronai Gaon (or R. 'Amram), to whom reference was made above (p. 412, cp. Appendix), probably are to be accounted for in the same manner. Hence the emphasis in section III of our text on the observance of the Torah even in the Diaspora. However, the main argument in this respect is unfortunately missing.

The second theme of this section to the effect that the (second) exile was not on account of the sins of the Jewish people but for other reasons, probably involved the idea of the Jewish mission to act as teachers to mankind. The author has alluded to this several times before (fols. 3a, l. 2, 6a, l. 5 ff., 9a, l. 6). Already the Church Fathers strongly resented this mission idea. Thus the venomous Chrysostomus of Antioch exclaimed: The Jews think that they have been dispersed in order to become the teachers of the nations, but God sent you out—you who are worse than the heathens, more cruel than the beasts, worse than the Sodomites—so that we should learn all sorts of crime from you.⁴⁴ A wonderful theological argument! It may also be surmised that in this section the author further dealt with the prophetic promises of the future restoration of Israel. There were Ḳaraïtes in Khurasān and Jibāl (Media) who held that the Messiah had already come and that the Temple built by Zerubbabel was to be the last one.⁴⁵ Also

⁴² Cp. Pozn., *RĒJ.*, L, 16–17, who identifies this sect, al-Maghārība (Makārība), with the Magharites who were a branch of the Essenes. See also *Reshumot*, I, 214.

⁴³ Cp. Tobias b. Moses in his *Oṣar Neḥmad* (*RĒJ.*, XXXIV, 181): ולא יוכל אדם למעון על זה הכלל שביארתי בזה השאלה כי אם זר ורשע וכפרן כמו נלעג הלשון משוי אל בעל בקי הארור ישחקו עצמותיו . . . אשר החטיא את ישראל, ירבעם שני, ארור הוא לאלהי ישראל וכל הנלווים עמו, כי כל עור ופסח אחריו הלך, אשר לא ידעו את יי' ואת יחודו ואת דרך מצותיו, אבל שמעו מן הארור מיעוט דין והקל עליהם עול התורה, והתיר להם מאכלות הגוים זבחי מתים ודם חוזרים ויין שמרים, והתיר להם ערוות אסורות ושומא ושחרה, וחלולי מועדי יי' ושבתותיו המקודשים, וכו'.

⁴⁴ See Lucas, *Zur Gesch. d. Juden im vierten Jahrhundert*, p. 8.

⁴⁵ *Ḳirkisānī*, l. c., 319, ll. 4–6: וכן קראין זראסאן ואלזבאל מן יועם אן אלמסיח: 4–6: וכדלך אלבית הו אלדי בנאה ורבבל ולם יבן גירה (cp. also *HUCA.*, VII, 395).

Sa'adyah found it necessary to oppose such theories.⁴⁶ Hence it stands to reason that, in connection with the discussion of the cause and purpose of the exile, our author took up the same problem of the prophetic promises which are yet to be fulfilled.

After the above analysis of the contents of our text, it is still impossible to state precisely who these "Jewish separatists" were, as far as our present fragmentary knowledge of the full extent of Jewish sectarianism, say in the 10th century, extends. They were not members of the regular group of *Ḳaraism*, though they had some identical views. They may have also shared some doctrines with the smaller sects preceding and succeeding 'Anan, but it would be altogether unwarranted to identify them with any of these.⁴⁷ Our author, who apparently lived in the 10th century, alludes to them as an active group of "separatist" non-conformists whose views and practices he found it incumbent to oppose for fear of their corrupting influence on traditional Jews. In the time of *Ḳirkisānī* (who wrote his work in 937) the smaller sects were practically extinct. Thus none was left of the followers of *Isma'il al-'Okbari*; the 'Ananites, small in number, were constantly decreasing; the followers of *Abū 'Isa al-Isphahānī* consisted of about 20 souls (in Damascus); and those of *Yudgān* were a small group in *Isphahān*. Only, among the *Ḳaraites* themselves there were many differences of opinion, as enumerated in

⁴⁶ ואחר הפרושים האלה אדבר על מי שהניעני: VIII, 7 (ed. Slucki, p. 126): כי יש אנשים שנקראים יהודים חושבים כי אלה המועדים ואלה הנחמות היו כלם בבית שני ועברו כי יש אנשים שנקראים יהודים חושבים כי אלה המועדים ואלה הנחמות היו כלם בבית שני ועברו. ולא נשאר מהם דבר, וכו'. About this expression "people who are called Jews" see the various views discussed by Pozn., *MGWJ.*, XXXIX, 441 ff.; cp. further *Semitic Studies in Memory of Alex. Kohut*, 438, and *JQR.*, X, 257-8; Schreiner, *ZfHB.*, III, 90, note 1, and again Pozn., *ibid.*, p. 176, note 22. See also *infra*, note 49.

⁴⁷ Above (note 7) the fancifulness of Marmorstein's identification with the 'Amramites (!), about which he has "no doubt," has been pointed out. He goes on to speak of the "Achbariten" (sic!) and refers us to Pozn., *RĖJ.*, XXXIV, 160. Now he presumably means his article on *Meswi al-'Okbari* which begins there on p. 161 ff. But *Meswi* and those who followed him were not sure as to which Sunday should be the date of *Shabu'ot* (see above, note 33) whereas the regular *Ḳaraites* kept this festival on the seventh Sunday following the first day of *Passover*, just as the Christians have their *Penetcost* on the seventh Sunday since *Easter*. This disposes of the "Achbarites" (read: 'Okbarites).

detail by Ẹirḳisānī.⁴⁸ However, the "separatists" were distinct from the Ẹaraites. Thus the former are to be classed neither as Rabbanites nor as Ẹaraites, but as non-conformist eclectics who, influenced by all sorts of doctrines obtaining in Jewish as well as in Muslim circles, rejected much of Rabbinic Judaism and, to a certain extent, even the commandments of the Torah. A figure like Ḥīwī al-Balkhī, that radical critic of the Bible, was also neither a Rabbanite nor a Ẹaraite. It is entirely unknown how these "separatists" were organized and where in Persia and Babylon they resided; also their numerical strength is obscure. Their origin should be placed in the 9th century. Although in the 6th decade of that century, owing to the policies of al-Mutawakkil, there was a tendency among the "Minim" to return to the fold of traditional Judaism (see *infra*, pp. 557–58), yet a good many of course did not take this step, especially since their readmission involved difficulties as to marital relationships. Anyhow there were "separatists" in the 10th century, as is evident from our text. Also Sa'adyah refers to "people who are called Jews" who believed in the transmigration of the soul and held that all the prophetic promises of Israel's future restoration applied already to the time of the second Temple.⁴⁹ He does not designate them

⁴⁸ *L. c.*, p. 317, top: ובעץ הזה אלפאריק קד בטלה. ודלך מלל אלמנאריה. ואלצדוקיה. וכללך אצחאב אסמעיל אלעכברי לס יבק מנהם אחד ולים אחד ממן שלב אלנזר פי הדא אלעצר ימיל אלי קולה. פאמא אלעאנניה פקד קלו גרא פכל מה נזו הם פי נקצאן. ואמא אצחאב אבי עיסי אלצפהאני פאן אלדי בקי מנהם בדמשק פקט שביה בעשרין נפסא. ואמא אליודנאניה פמנהם נפר יסיר באצפהאן. ניר אן אלללף קד כלר פי הדא אלעצר בין אצחאבנא גרא. See his enumeration of the Ẹaraite differences in ch. 19 (*ibid.*, pp. 317–319), and cp. *HUCA.*, VII, 391–96.

⁴⁹ See *אור*, VI, 8 (ed. Slucki, p. 103), and the passage cited above, note 46. Poznański's insistence that the Gaon referred therein to a part of the Ẹaraites is not likely because of the following consideration. The theory of transmigration was adopted by 'Anan, not mentioned here, although previously in ch. VI, 1 (ed. Slucki, p. 96) he is cited by name. The 'Ananites, who presumably followed suit in this respect, were a handful in the Gaon's time (as his contemporary, Ẹirḳisānī, informed us). However, in the respective passage (VI, 8) we read: (קומא ממן) יהודים וקוראים אותו ההעתקה, וענינו אצלם שרוח יחסמן באלהיה (מצאתים אומרים בהשנות, וקוראים אותו ההעתקה, וענינו אצלם שרוח ראובן תשוב אל שמעון, ואחר כך בלוי, ואחר כך ביהודה. ויש מהם רבים (ומנהם) אן אכלהם) שאומרים יש פעמים שתהיה רוח האדם בבהמה ורוח הבהמה באדם, ודברים רבים מזה השעון וערובו, וכו'. Such phraseology would hardly refer to the small

"Karaites," although some of the latter shared these views, but "so-called" Jews similar to our nondescript "separatists."

Finally, a few words about the identity of the author. His name and place are entirely unknown. As he refers to the Mu'tazila theologians al-Jubbai and Abū Hāshim (above, p. 426), we have a date that leads us to the first half of the 10th century (the latter died in 933). In this century our author also should be placed because of the contents of his work and of his rather archaic Hebrew style; also the Genizah MS. of our text is of early handwriting. His whereabouts somewhere in Babylon (say Baghdād), or in Persia, are apparent from his polemics against the Jewish "separatists" who flourished in these countries. Also his statement that no Samaritans were ever seen outside of Palestine, in contradiction to the fact of their residence in Egypt and in Syria, can be explained by reason of his living in the eastern part of the Caliphate (see above, p. 417). Marmorstein's identification of the author with David b. Merwān al-Muḥammaṣ (*l.c.*, 49 and 56) has no basis whatever (see already above, p. 417 f.). Because section I of our text treats of the Unity of God, Marm. discovered here the Hebrew introduction to David's **אלהינו**. But, on the one hand, the latter was entirely in Arabic, just as all his other works, and dealt with problems (questions) about the Unity followed by an explanation of the Ten Commandments,⁵⁰ whereas, on the other hand, our book had a section on prayer and another on the validity of the Law in the Diaspora as well as on the causes of the exile, in addition to several more portions whose topics are unknown. Moreover, we have here a part of *an entire work in Hebrew* and not a mere introduction; there is a long preface, and

group of 'Ananites (as would result from Poznański's contention), but rather to a considerable number of "nondescript" Jews, neither Rabbanites nor Karaites (or 'Ananites), just as the "separatists" of our text were, who believed in this theory of transmigration, sharing it with numerous Muslims of the same ilk (see Schreiner, *Der Kalām in d. Jüd. Liter.*, p. 66, top).

⁵⁰ See my remarks in *JQR.*, NS., XVI, p. 90. The Genizah book list (*JQR.*, XIII, 54, No. 68) mentions a **מקמץ לר' אלתחין** which is most likely the same as *ibid.*, p. 60: **כתאב פיה מסאיל פי אלתחין ותפסיר נבא עשר הספרות**: **נכת עשר הדברות** (so the MS. Adler 2622 reads, **עלי טריק אלעקל ואלכתאב**). **לראור בן מרון אלמקמץ אלרקי**. It begins forthwith in Arabic and not in Hebrew. About his other works cp. Pozn., *ibid.*, 328–29.

there is section I, ch. 1, intended as an introduction, followed by six more chapters, and subsequently by other sections of which parts of II and III are preserved. The comprehensive title of the opus cannot even be guessed.⁵¹ One has therefore patiently to refrain from rash surmises until more Genizah leaves will turn up, as it is to be hoped, of this interesting, though polemically harsh, work that helps us to understand a significant phase of the religious and intellectual strivings among the Jews of the Orient.

⁵¹ Bahya ibn Paḳūda in the introduction to his *Torat Ḥobot Halebabot* mentions Sa'adyah's *Emunot we-De'ot*, a work called "The Roots of Religion" and al-Muḳammaṣ's chief philosophic-theological book, viz. his "Twenty Treatises" (*Kitāb al-hidāyah*, ed. Yahuda, p. 8, top: מלל כתאב כספר האמונות ואלאמאנות ואלאעתקאדאת וכתאב אצול אלדין וכתאב אלמקמץ (וספר שרשי הדת וספר המקמץ). The middle item is unknown, but it apparently also was in Arabic just as the first and the third, and hence no surmise would be warranted as to its identity with the Hebrew work under discussion here.

TEXT

נדף א'—ב' ח'—ח' הם מכ"י אדלר סי' 2683, דף ג'—ו' הם מכ"י T.-S. 8K 202, ודף ט'—י' מכ"י הגניזה מעזבונו של רש"י שכטר ז"ל.¹

דף א', ע"א

והחברים² באשר השמדו מן תורת יי'
והיו עליה³ עדים⁴ ועוד כתוב בו⁵
כי יי' בחר באדם ונח ובית עמרם על
כל העולמים משפחה מיעוטה מכולה
5 ואלה יודע ועד⁶ וכנהג רבות⁷

1 כ"י אדלר ושכטר נעתקו מעצם הקטעים, וכ"י קמברג' ע"פ צילום חדש, ועל ידו נחקנו הטעויות שעלו ב-JQR, מ"ח, כרך י"ב, 138–145.

2 אותיות ח' וב' מטושטשות.

3 אות ע' מטושטשת.

4 סימן זה נמצא בכ"י בכמה מקומות לציין סופו של משפט.

5 היינו בקוראן כי המחבר הולך ומצטט בתרגום עברי סורה ג' (סורה אהל עמראן), ל'. מזה ברור שבשורות 1–2 (עד 'עדים') ישנו סופו של פסוק מאיזו סורה בקוראן.

6 בקוראן: 'אן אללה אצטפי אדם ונוחא ואהל אברהים ואהל עמראן עלי אלעאלמין דריה בעצהא מן בעץ ואללה סמיע עליס'. אחרי, ונח' חסר בתרגום פה, ובית אברהם'. בסוף הפסוק התרגום היה צריך להיות, ואלוה שומע יודע', אלא שהמחבר בחר פה במבטא העברי 'יודע ועד' (ע"פ הפסוק בירמיה כ"ט, כ"ג: ואנכי היודע ועד נאם ה').

7 היינו בספר זה (בקוראן).

ואלו בחרנו להפכו⁸ ולהשיבו כקדמותו⁹
 להעמיד כל אות ואות¹⁰ ממקומו כבר
 נגלה יסודו היו יודעים לנפשם. ולו חכמו
 ישכילו זאת¹¹ לא הלכו באשר התהלכו.
¹⁰ כללו שלדבר לא יוכל איש מכל האומרים
¹² יש אלוה ונביא ודת לצאת מתחת התורה
 הקדושה. בלת¹³ כל עם ועם יוסיף ויגדע
 ויבדאו מלבם לעשות להם שם. ודברים
 אחרים יש בהם סוד גדול.¹⁴ כאשר עשו
¹⁵ בני השמרונים אשר החזיקו באשר
 למדם הכהן השמרוני אשר הקימו¹⁵
 להם אסר חדן.¹⁶ ולא יכלו לדבר צחות לשון
 קודש אבותינו כי היו עלגי לשון ועמקי
 שפה.¹⁷ ולא ראו אבותינו חשבים אל ירוש'¹⁸

דף א', ע"ב

מבבל להביאם בקהל יש'¹⁹ ולא לבנות ע'²⁰
 עמהם בית י' אלהינו כאשר בקשו מהם
 באמרם להם נבנה עמכם²¹ מפני ג' דברים.²²

■ כנראה המובן של "הפך" פה הוא לתרגם. השוה הכתובת בראש ספר "הוריית הקורא"
 (עיי' RĒJ, כרך כ"ג, עמ' 310): "ור' נתנאל בר' משלם ע"א: ר' משלם בן נתנאל) הפכו
 מלשון ערבי ללשון הקדש בעיר מיינצא". עיי' גם מה שמצטט ניבויאר מכי פרמא (JQR, כרך
 ד', 616-618): "תרגום זה בנקודו נעתק מספר אשר הובא מארץ בבל והיה מנוקד מלמעלה בנקוד
 ארץ אשר והפכו (המובן פה: העתיקו לנקוד טבראני) ר' נתן בר מכיר בר מנחם מאנקונא ...
 והגיהו ונסחו לנקוד טברני".

⁹ היינו להשיב את הדברים שבקוראן למקור שממנו נובעים.

¹⁰ כל פסוק ופסוק שבקוראן (בערבית א' 4).

¹¹ ע"פ הפסוק בדברים ל"ב, כ"ט.

¹² שיש.

¹³ היינו: אלא שכל עם ועם מוסיף על התורה או גורע ממנה.

¹⁴ "סוד גדול" זה הוא מה שעשו עשרת הוקנים למוחמד (להלן, דף ד', ע"ב, שו' 17 והלאה).

מכאן ואילך המחבר נותן דוגמאות למשפטו זה "כללו של דבר" וכו', ומוכיר את השומרונים,
 הנוצרים, ומיסד דת האסלאם.

¹⁵ צ"ל: הקים.

¹⁶ עיי' עזרא ד', ב'.

¹⁷ עיי' ישעיה ל"ג, י"ט.

¹⁸ =ירושלים.

¹⁹ =ישראל.

²⁰ אות ראשונה של המלה בשורה הבאה.

²¹ עזרא ד', ב'.

²² היינו: טעמים (ועיי' בהקדמה).

האחד מפני כי אינם מבני יש' ועתידים
 5 בני יש' לגלות שניה וישאר הבית והארץ
 בידם ולא יודע כי המה בני יש' וגם המה.²³
 ואם²⁴ את י' היו יראים אלהיהם היו עבדים
 כמשפטם.²⁵ אנשי²⁶ בבל עשו את סכות
 בנות ואנשי כות עשו את גרגל ואנשי סכות²⁷
 10 עשו את אשימא והעוים עשו נבחן ואת
 תרתק והספרויים שרפים את בניהם באש
 לאדרמלך וענמלך אלהי ספרויים. וכי
 על כן לא הביאום אבות' זכ' לב' ²⁸ בקהל י'
 כולם יחד בפעם אחד. ואף על פי כן המה²⁹
 15 מביאים גרים ומקבלים אותם לא ראו
 להביא אלה ביניהם. וישארו³⁰ גם המה
 על אותו המעשה עד אשר שבו מעב'³¹
 מעבודתם הזרה וַלְמָדוּ וַלְמָדוּ בלשונותם
 הלעונה לקראת³² התורה אשר לְמָדוּ³³ מהכהן³⁴

דף ב', ע"א

מהכהן השמרונים³⁵ אשר לא מבני לוי המה
 כי מיתר כהני במות ירבעם אשר עשה
 ככ'³⁶ ויצו מלך אשור לאמר הוליכו שמה
 אחד מהכהנים אשר הגליתם משם וילכו

23 היינו: אם היהודים הגולים הם בני ישראל או השמרונים.

24 כאן מתחיל הטעם השני.

25 עיין מ"ב י"ז, ל"ג.

26 במ"ב י"ז, ל': ואנשי.

27 צ"ל: חמת.

28 = אבותינו זכרם לברכה.

29 היינו: ואע"פ שאבותינו כפי הנהוג היו מקבלים גרים מעמים אחרים, לא קבלו את הכותים.

לפי פירא, פליח בסופו (ומשם נעתק לתנחומא, וישב, סי' ב'), כשהחרימו עזרא ובני סיעתו את השמרונים התנו שאל יתנייר אדם כותי (בתנח': אל יתנייר כותי בישראל). (ואולי תחת כן צ"ל פה כ"י).

30 פה מתחיל הטעם הג', היינו שהשמרונים למדו את התורה מכהן שלא היה משבט לוי.

31 התחלת המלה הבאה.

32 = לקרוא.

33 בנקוד זה שבכ"י הפתח משמש בתור קמץ, וכן כמה פעמים אח"כ.

34 מלה זו נכפלה בכ"י בתור שומרת על סדר הדפים (מה שקורין Clavis).

35 צ"ל השמרוני.

36 = ככתוב (מ"ב י"ז, כ"ז-כ"ח).

5 וישבו שם ויורם את משפט אלהי הארץ.
 ויבא אחד מהכהנים אשר הגלו משמרון
 וישב בבית אל ויהי מורה אתם איך
 ייראו את יי': כמשפט³⁷ בני יש' אשר
 הדיח אותם ירבעם בן נבט אשר עשה
 10 כהנים מקצת³⁸ העם אשר לא היו מבני לוי:
 ככ' ויהיו יראים את יי' ויעשו להם מק'
 מקצותם כהני במות ויהיו עושים להם
 בבית הבמות.³⁹ פשוטו⁴⁰ ויהיו יראים
 את יי' מהראיות⁴¹ אשר שלח בם ויעשו להם
 15 מקצותם כהני⁴² כאשר עשה ירבעם ויעש
 כהנים מקצת³⁸ העם: ויהיו עושים להם
 בבית הבמות אשר עשה ירבעם ובני יש'
 אחריו ככ' רק⁴³ הבמות לא סרו עוד העם
 מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות. ועל אחס⁴⁴

דף ב', ע"ב

המעשים הם המה עד היום הזה. יראים
 את יי' לשמור שבתותיו ומצותיו וחוקיו
 ומשפטיו כאשר למדם אותו הכהן השמרוני
 אשר לא היה מבני לוי.⁴⁵ והמה אומרים

37 מחברנו מפרש פה שהכהן הזה הורם לירא את ה', כמשפט בני ישראל' לפני גלות עשרת השבטים.

38 = מקצות (עיין מ"א י"ב, ל"א).

39 מ"ב י"ז, ל"ב.

40 פשוטו של פסוק זה.

41 מתוקן מלמעלה, היינו "מהאירות". בפרושו זה המחבר הולך אחרי דעתו של ר' ישמעאל,

ש"כותים גרי אריות הן וכהנים שנטמעו בהן כהנים כשרים היו' וכו'. השוה ג"כ להלן, דף ד', ע"א, שו', 8-9 (ועיין בהקדמה).

42 צריך להוסיף: במות.

43 צ"ל: אך (עיין מ"א כ"ב, מ"ה).

44 = אותם.

45 הפך מה שנאמר במ"ב י"ז, ל"ד: "עד היום הזה הם עשים כמשפטים הראשונים אינם יראים את ה' ואינם עושים כחקתם וכמשפטם וכתורה וכמצוה אשר צוה ה' את בני יעקב", המחבר לא היה יכול להכחיש את המציאות שבזמנו (וכבר כמה וכמה דורות לפניו) השמרונים היו זהירים בקיום המצות שבתורה. השוה גם מאמרו של רשב" (קידושין ע"ו, ע"א): "כל מצוה שהחזיקו בה כותים הרבה מדקדקים בה יותר מ ישראל". וכן מתפאר בזהירות זו השמרוני אבו אלחסן אלצורי כדברי פולמוס שלו נגד היהודים (עיי' מאמרו של הלסין, Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, כרך ז', עמ' 27, הע' 68).

- 5 כי תורת י' אתנו לא נסור ממנה ימין ושמ'.⁴⁶
 נשמור שבתות י' ומשפטיו ועדותיו וט'
 ושמאח וטהרה במי נדה וקרבות שבת
 ומועדי אל זובה.⁴⁷ זובה ויולדת ומצורע
 ושמטים ויובלות וכל הכתוב בתורת משה.
 10 כי אנחנו בני יש' האמור בנו כי אתם ה'
 המעט מכל העמים.⁴⁸ ובנו בחר י' אלהינו
 לעדי עד. וכל ההוסיף.⁴⁹ על תורת אלהינו
 כמו דברי כל נביא וחזה וכל המקרא
 והכתובים לא.⁵⁰ נאמר בו כענין שנ'.⁵¹ את כל
 15 הדבר לא תוסיף עליו ולא תגרע ממנו.
 והמה לא ידעים.⁵² עדותם על נפשם
 כי הנאמר בהם כי אתם המעט מכל העמים

דף ג', ע"א

- הם המה המגופצים בכל העמים.⁵³ בעבור
 אשר המה ממלאכת.⁵⁴ כהנים לכל העמים.
 הנושאים טענותם.⁵⁵ לעולמים. [ו] גם המה.⁵⁶
 המקובצים מכל העמים ככ' והפיצך י'
 5 בכל העמים. ושב וקבצך מכל העמים
 אשר הפיצך י' אלהיך שמה.⁵⁷ וכאשר בא
 והאמן.⁵⁸ הניפוץ כך יבוא וינאמן הקיבוץ
 ולא יאחר. ולא זכרו השוטים עניי

46 = ושמאל.

47 צ"ל: זב.

48 דברים ז', ז'.

49 צ"ל: המוסיף.

50 צ"ל: הלא.

51 = שנאמר, דברים י"ג, א'. המעתיק קצר פה אמצע הפסוק: אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם אותו
 תשמרו לעשות. על ידי פסוק זה השומרונים טוענים שהצדק אתם במה שמחזיקים רק בתורה
 ולא בנביאים וכתובים.

52 = יודעים.

53 היינו בני ישראל ולא השומרונים. (השוה להלן שו' 10-13).

54 צ"ל: ממלכת (שמות י"ט, ו').

55 כנראה במובן עולם של הגויים, ובכן, טענה פה היא כמו, טענה.

56 היינו: בני ישראל יהיו לעתיד המקובצים מכל העמים.

57 דברים כ"ח, ס"ד; ל', ג'.

58 צ"ל: והאמן. הקהבר משתמש בהפעיל זה במובן קיים, אישר, אולם לצורך זה היו עושים

פֶּעַל אימן (עיין הדוגמאות במלון לבן-יהודה, א', 284).

הדעת⁵⁹ כי גם המה יעידו על נפשם וכל
 לאומים ועם ולשון יעידו כי מעולם
 10 עין לא ראת שמור[ונ]ין בשאר ארצות הגוים
 ממזרח ועד מערב בלתי בארץ פל[שתי]ם
 לבדה⁶⁰ וּגְם⁶¹ בני אדם ועשו ושעיר
 הנקראים נדודים⁶² עשו גַּם[ם] המה בשטותם
 15 בערמה וילכו אחר[י] הבלי [ה]תועים אותם
 אחרי אלהי הנכר⁶³ הנולד לו בן[ן] מאשת[ו]ן היהודיה
 המנאפת תחת [א]ישנה[ן] החרש עצים⁶⁴ אשר[ן]
 הרגוהו מקצה . . . [ו]תלוהו [ע]ל [ו]עץ גבוה
 ותלול בין שני גבבים⁶⁵ גַּם[ם] . . . [מ]ני שקייתו

דף ג', ע"ב

סיד בחומץ⁶⁶ ואלוה לא יציל את נפשו⁶⁷
 מיד מבקשו⁶⁸ רעתו יועיל לאחרים וזלחו.
 ועל [ה]שנות^{68a} עונותם כי כל יום יוסיפו
 עדות על אלהים^{68b} כי הוא במעי אם מתואר
 5 בבמותם משוח בששר ומחופה מצופה
 בזהב ובכסף חקוק מחוקה⁶⁹ על כל קירות

59 היינו: השומרונים.

60 אמנם זה אי-נכון כי נמצאו שומרונים במצרים וגם בדמשק ובשאר מקומות בסוריה. אולם
 המחבר שגר לפי הנראה במזרח (בבבל או בפרס), ידע רק ע"א מציאותם בא"י.

61 מכאן ועד סוף דף ד', ע"א, הנדון הוא הנוצריות.

62 איני יודע מובן מלה זו בתור כנוי של "בני אדם ועשו ושעיר". ואולי צ"ל: נדודים.

63 באופן סטירי המחבר רומז שאלהים שיש לו בן הוא אלהי הנכר. לאורך ניסא בפסוק:
 וְהָיָה אֵלֶּיךָ נִכְרָא (דברים ל"א, ט"ז) מצאו גימטריא "ישו" (עיי' R. E. J., כרך
 ע"ב, 122, ס"י י"ב).

64 עיין מתי י"ג, נ"ה. כפי מרקוס ו', ג', ישו בעצמו היה חרש עצים.

65 השוה מתי כ"ז, ל"ח ומ"ד, מרקוס ט"ו, כ"ז.

66 במתי כ"ז, ל"ד, נאמר שנתנו לו יין מהול בראש, אולם נ"א הוא חומץ כמו בפסוק מ"ח.
 אבל כפי מרקוס ט"ו, כ"ג, היין היה מהול במור, וזה הוא כפי המנהג העברי (סנהדרין מ"ג, ע"א:
 היוצא ליהרג משקין אותו קורט שלבונה בכוס של יין כדי שתטרף דעתו; השוה שמחות פ"ב,
 ו' ומשקין אותו יין כדי שלא יצטער, וכפי נ"א בהוצ' היגר, עמ' 105, יין ולבונה. עיין נ"כ במ"ד
 י', ד': מכאן אמרו כל הנהרגים בב"ד היו משקין אותו יין חי כדי שתטרף דעתו עליו וכו'). הפרט
 פה "סיד בחומץ" אי-ידוע לי ממקום אחר.

67 השוה ישעיה מ"ד, כ'.

68 צ"ל: מבקשי.

68a ע"פ הפסוק: ועל השנות החלום (בראשית מ"א, ל"ב).

68b צ"ל: אלוהיהם.

69 עיין יחזקאל כ"ג, י"ד.

טירותם עם כל צלמי מסכותם יום הולדו
 ואמו מניקתו ואומנתו עד יום תפיסתו
 והריגתו ותליתו. ואחרי כן ידברו עליו
 דברים אשר לא כן ולא היו מעולם. 10
 אחרי שהוציאוהו מכלל החיים שמוהו
 ו[א]מרו עליו כי הוא מחיה מתים. ואשר
 התעוּם [וה]טוּעוּם מקרב התורה באו במ' 70
 במרמתם [כ]י אמרו להם בתורה מצאוי 71
 על בני יש' בנין אחם לי'י אלהיכם. 72 וכתוב 15
 אחר אומ' 73 בנ'י ב[כורי יש']. וישו בן פנדרא
 [א]חד מבני יש' [והנקראים] בנים. וכל בן יש'
 לו אב וא[ב]יהם [ש]ליש' ב[שמים ורוחותם
 שליש' [בשמים כ]א[שר] דברה הנבואה

דף ד', ע"א
 על ידי ישעיהו בן אמוץ הנביא ועתה
 י'י אלהים שלחני ורוחו: 74 וכי על כן קראו
 לישו בן פנדרא אבא וברא ורוחא דקודשא
 כאשר מצוי 75 בכל בני יש'. וזה 76 אחד מהם.
 5 אז שמע 77 אליהם. וקמו עליו 78 כל יש' ועשו

70 התחלת המלה הבאה.

71 = מצוי.

72 דברים י"ד, א'.

73 = אומר, שמות ד', כ"ב.

74 ישעיה מ"ח, ט"ו.

75 היינו רוח הקדש. כמובן המשפט שקראו לישו אבא וברא ורוחא דקודשא (והדגמה
 הנוצרית הידועה) הוא אי-מדויק. באופן יותר נכון כותב הדסי (אשכל הכפר, אלפא ביתא
 צ"ח, שנשמטה בדפוס ע"י הצנוורה ונתפרסמה על ידי באָר, JQR, כרך ח', 432): "ואמרו
 כי הוא (השם) אב ובן ורוח הקדש, והאב הוא כולל עיקר האלהות, ודברו הוא הבן ולבש בשר
 כדרך בני האדם, ורוח הקדש היא חכמתו ונבואת נביאיו והושוו שלשתם והן כאחד (ועיין ספרי
 בהקדמה). הדגמה. אבא וברא ורוחא דקודשא" נזכרה ע"י רה"ג בפירושו לברכות (ועיין ספרי
 Texts and Studies, ח"א, 606), וע"י הקראי יפת בן עלי בפרושו לעובדיה (עיי' מרגליות,
A Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Jepheth b. Ali the Karaite, עמ' VII
 הע' 1).

76 היינו ישו הוא אחד מבני ישראל. וע"א פסקא זו מן "ואשר התעוּם הטועים" וכו' (דף ג',
 ע"ב, שו" 12 והלאה) עיין בהקדמה.

77 כנראה צ"ל: שמעו, היינו שהאמינים שמעו לטועים אשר התעוּם בטענות שמזכיר המחבר.
 78 כאן המחבר חוזר לישו שנהרג בתור מסית ומדיח, כאשר כתוב בתורה: "היינו כפי
 המשפט שכתוב בדברים, יג, ז'-יב), והחליה על עץ (דף ג', ע"א, שו" 18) היא כפי דברים
 כ"א, אולם "חבריו" לא נהרגו באותו זמן.

בו ובחביריו אתו⁷⁹ המעשה כאשר כתוב
 בתורה⁸⁰ ואילו האנשים אינם ככותים
 השמרונים כי הכותיים באו בעל כרחם
 מפני האריות הממיתים אתם.⁸⁰ ואילו הנצרים
 לא באו אלא להסתפח בנחלת יי'⁸¹ והתעומו
 תועיהם באמור להם כי אתם בני יש' ה'
 החדשים ולכם נתנה התורה החדשה
 ולב חדש וברית חדש⁸² ושמים חדשים
 ולאֶרֶץ⁸³ חדשה. ולא תזכרנה הראשונות
 ולא תעלנה על לב.⁸⁴ וזה הוא משיח בן דוד
 בן בת דוד. ואביו שבשמים שמהו אבנא
 אחגרת מטורא דלא בדיין ומחת
 לצלמא והות לטור רב ומלתא⁸⁵ כל ארעא.

דף ד', ע"ב

ולא חרה לי עד מות אלא על אחינו⁸⁶ מוריננו⁸⁷
 הסרבים הסלונים⁸⁸ הנגעים בנחלה אשר הנחיל
 אלהינו וקראנו עמו וצאן ידו וחלקו חבל נחלתו.⁸⁹
 ודבר על ידי עבדיו הנביאים כי לא יחליפם⁹⁰
 5 ולא ימיר אתנו⁹¹ טוב ברע או רע בטוב ולא

79 =אותו.

80 =אותם (השוה מ"ב י"ז, כ"ו), ועיין למעלה, הע' 41.

81 ע"פ הפסוק בש"א כ"ז, י"ט.

82 צ"ל: חדשה.

83 הל' מנוקדת מלמעלה ומלמטה להורות שצ"ל: וארץ.

84 עיין יחזקאל יח, ל"א, ול"ז, כ"ז; ירמיה ל"א, ל'; ישעיה ס"ה, י"ז. כידוע, אבות הכנסייה

דרשו פסוקים כאלה בתור רמזים להאמונה החדשה. הנוצרים הם, לפי דעתם, "ישראל האמתי".

עיין למשל דיסטל, *Gesch. d. Alten Test. in d. chr. Kirche* (1869), מ' 42-44, והארנאק,

Mission u. Ausbreitung d. Christentums (1902), 49 הע' 3, 289. השוה

ג"כ רס"ז, אמונות ודעות, ג', ח' בסוף (הוצ' סלוצקי, עמ' 69): ומצאתי זולת אלה טוען בדברי

ירמיהו הנה ימים באים נאם יי', וכתתי אח בית יהודה: ברית חדשה. ואמרת לי: ראה מה שאחריו,

כי כבר פירש שהברית הזאת החדשה היא התורה עצמה, וכו'.

85 צ"ל: ומלאת (דניאל ב', ל"ד-ל"ה).

86 המחבר פונה כנראה כאן לבעלי כת יהודית בזמנו שנבדלו מכלל ישראל וקבלו דעות

שונות מדתות אחרות (ועיין בהקדמה).

87 המורים ביי' (השוה במדבר כ', י': שמעו נא המרים).

88 השוה יחזקאל ב', ו'.

89 השוה תהלים צ"ה, ז', ודברים ל"ב, ט'.

90 צ"ל: יחליפנו.

91 =אותנו, וע"פ הפסוק בויקרא כ"ז, י'.

ישׁוב לשחת ולא לכלה ולא לשנות ככ' כי
 אני י'י לא שניתי ואתם בני יעקב לא כליחם.⁹²
 לא דיים חרפת הגוים השאננים אויבינו
 אשר אלהינו קצף מעט עלינו והמה עזרו
 לרעה⁹³ עזרום⁹⁴ בלא בצע כסף כי אם לבגוד
 בנו ולדבר עלינו רעה. ועל י'י אלהינו תועה.
 ואילו עשו כאשר עשו לנו אויבינו⁹⁵ אשר העלם
 אסר חרון מכותה.⁹⁶ וכאשר עשו הבאים א'
 אחריהם עם הרועה צאן⁹⁷ במקום הידוע
 בהר חדש. והיה מעשה עם הנזיר אשר היה
 במקום הנקרא בלקין על העמוד הנודע אות
 השמש.⁹⁸ עם העשרה הזקנים אברהם הנקרא כעב
 אלאחבאר ואבשלום הנקרא עבד אללה בן סלאם

דף ה', ע"א

ויעקב הנק' ^{98a} עמר אלשהיד ויוחנן הנקרא אלמנהום
 אלי אלגנה וחביריהם אישי⁹⁹ בשמו וכינויו אשר
 באו אליו ועשו לו אונות הקלון וכתבו והרכיבו
 שמותם כל אחד ואחד. וכן כתוב בהף ג' ¹⁰⁰

⁹² מלאכי ב', ו'.

⁹³ השוה זכריה א', ט"ו.

⁹⁴ היינו בעלי הכת הזאת עזרו לגוים נגד ישראל.

⁹⁵ היינו השומרונים (ועיין למעלה דף א', ע"א, שורה 14 והלאה).

⁹⁶ השוה מ"ב, י"ז, כ"ד, ועזרא ד', ב'.

⁹⁷ היינו: מוחמד. נקרא, רועה צאן מפני שבנערותו היה מוכרח להרויח פרנסתו באופן

כזה (עיין Sprenger, ח"א, עמ' 147). אולם בזמן התחלת נבואתו כבר היה סוחר אחרי שגשא

את חריגה. הר חדש הוא כנראה הר חירא אצל מכה, שם קבל את חזיונותיו הראשונים. עי' ז'

נקרא ההר, ובל אלנור (הר של אש), זה הוא, הר חדש. הנזיר הוא בחירא שגר, לפי אנדה

אחת בבלקין (בלקא, המחוז הדרומי של עבר הירדן), והיה מקודם יהודי בשם, בחור' או

בהיר, וכשנעשה נוצרי נקרא גיאורניוס או סרניס (עיין על אודות הפרטים האלה ב-JQR

מ"ח, כרך י"ב, עמ' 128-129). הנזיר הזה כנראה בלה את ימיו על עמוד (στυλή) הנודע בשם

אות השמש, ובכן היה στυλῖτης (Stylite). ועל אודות, העשרה הזקנים עיין בהקדמה.

⁹⁸ כנראה צ"ל: ועם.

^{98a} = הנקרא.

⁹⁹ כמו: כל איש ואיש.

¹⁰⁰ = בסורה, היינו ע"י חילוף האותיות באופן א"ת ב"ש אות ח' = ס', פ' = ו', ג' = ר', וצ' = ה'.

(כמו שפטר לנכון ע. צ. מלמד ב, חריב'י, כרך ב', עמ' 81, הע' 1). כנראה המחבר היה נוהר

מלכתוב בפירוש, בסורה הפרה' (היינו: סורה ב' המפורסמת, סורה אלבקרה) מפני פחד

המוסלמים, וע"כ סתם את הדבר בכתבו, בהף ג' הפרה'. כידוע ההשתמשות בא"ת ב"ש לשם

הסתור דבר נמצאת כבר במלות, ששך' (=בבל) ו, לב קמ" (=כשדים), ירמיה כ"ה, כ"ו, ונ"א,

א' ומ"א.

- 5 הקָּרָה. ככה יַעֲצוּ חֲכָמֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לַאֲלֹהֵי הָרָשָׁע.
 וְכָל זֹאת כִּי הִיְתָה סִבָּה לִּבְעֹבֹר לְהַצִּיל עִם
 יְיָ לִמְעַן לֹא יִזְיָקוּ בַּעֲלִילוֹתָיו. וְכֹאשֶׁר עָשָׂו
 הִבְאִים אַחֲרֵיהֶם עִם הָרֹעָה צֹאן¹⁰¹ לְהִיבְדֹּל¹⁰²
 מִבַּחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים וְאִמּוֹנָתָם תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְלוֹסֹר
 10 מֵאִמּוֹנֵנוּ אֶל וּמַחֲקוֹת הַתּוֹרָה הַקְּדוּשָׁה ב'
 בַּחֲפוּתָם וְשִׁעוֹתָם וְכִסְלוֹתָם וְתַעֲוֹתָם. וְהִבֵּל
 אֲשֶׁר הִלְכוּ בּוֹ אַחֲרֵי רוּחַם וְאַחֲרֵי מַחֲשַׁבוֹתָם
 וְטוֹחַם וְיִהְיֶה לָּם. וְהִלְכוּ אַחֲרָיו וְנִכְשְׁלוּ. כִּי אִמְרוּ¹⁰³
 כִּרְתָּנוּ בְּרִית אֶת מוֹבְדֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִאשִׁית
 15 הַיָּרֵחַ וּדְבָרִים אֲחֵרִים. וְעַם אָדָם עָשִׂינוּ חֲזוּה
 עַל וּסְפָרְתָם לָכֵם מִמַּחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת.^{103a} כִּי שָׁמְנוּ כּוֹב
 הַכּוֹתִים עָלֵינוּ לֹא תִּבְעֲרוּ אֶשׁ בְּכָל מִשְׁ¹⁰⁴ וְנוֹ'
 מַחֲסִינוּ. וּבִשְׁקָרֵינוּ בְּרִי מֵאֲנִים נִסְתַּרְנוּ הַאֲוִמִּים
 עָלֵינוּ מִצּוֹת יְיָ אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשִׂינָהּ וְלֹאשֶׁר לֹא תַעֲשִׂינָהּ

דָּף ה', ע"ב

- כִּי הִמָּה בִּלְבוֹת הַמַּמְלָלִים¹⁰⁵ שְׁמוֹנִים עַד עַתָּה
 בָּא עֵתָם: וְלֹא אִמְרוּ כִּי יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ הִמְעִלָה אֶתֵּנוּ
 מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם¹⁰⁶ בְּמִסּוֹת בָּאוֹתוֹת וּבְמוֹפְתִים
 וּבְמַלְחָמָה וּבִיד חֹזֶק וּבִזְרוּעַ נְטוּיָה וּבְמוֹרָאִים
 5 גְּדוֹלִים¹⁰⁷ אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִבְרָאוּ בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל הַגּוֹיִם.¹⁰⁸
 הַשְּׁמִיעֵנוּ אֶת הוֹד קוֹלוֹ מִתּוֹךְ עֲנִי כְבוֹדוֹ
 וְנִתֵּן לָנוּ אֶת תּוֹרָתוֹ מוֹרֶשֶׁה תּוֹרַת אַחַת חֻקִּים וּמִ'
 וּמִשְׁפָּטִים צְדִיקִים חֻקִּים עַל לִוְחוֹת הָאֶבֶן
 כְּתוּבִים בְּאֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים לְשׁוֹם לָנוּ שֵׁם גְּדוֹלוֹת

101 הנקודות מורות שצריך להסיר משפט זה שנכתב פה בטעות.
 102 פה הוא ההמשך של דף ד', ע"ב, שו' 11, היינו: שאנשי הכת, אשר המחבר מתנגד להם, עשו מה שעשו כדי, להיבדל מבחירי אל' וכו'. ולהלן (דף ט', ע"א, שו' 14) הוא קורא אותם: מובדלי בני ישראל (ועיין בהקדמה).
 103 השוה ישעיה כ"ח, ט"ו. ועל אודות פסקא זו עיין בהקדמה.
 103a ויקרא כ"ג, ט"ז.
 104 =משבתיכם (שמות ל"ה, ג').
 105 בני אדם שיש להם כח הדבור (וכמו כן להלן, דף ט', ע"א, שו' 13). "ממלל" הוא כמו בערבית, נאמק', מה שר' אבן תבון מתרגם, מדבר' (עיי' רס"ג, אמונות ודעות, הקדמה, הוצ' סלוצקי, עמ' 18): "כאב לבי על מיני מן המדברים" (בערבית: אלנאטקין).
 106 השוה ירמיה ב', ו'.
 107 השוה דברים ד', ל"ד.
 108 השוה שמות ל"ד, י'.

- 10 ונוראות: 109 ולתתנו¹¹⁰ עליונים על כל הגוים אשר
 תשב לתהלה ולשם ולתפארת ועם קדוש כאשר
 דבר. ללמוד וללמד כל העמים חק ומשפט
 לנסותם באותותיה ומופתיה לדעת את אשר
 בלבבם הישמרו מצותיו אם לא: 111
 15 במצפוני הלבבות ולא בקרבי הכליות כי אם
 לשמור ולעשות בפה ובלב וכל ההרגשות החמשה
 ואחרית הארבעה הנדמים לארבעה המריחים
 בארבעה הנפרטים¹¹² לעשרה ונחשבים בעשרה
 והם דומים לעשרה על שומעי העשרה הנחשב

דף ו', ע"א

מאצבעות עשרה חסף טינא ומן קרניא עשר
 קרן ועירא¹¹³ לשום לנו שם גדולות ונוראות
 ולתתנו עליונים על כל הגוים אשר תשב¹¹⁴

109 השוה ישעיה ל', ל'; דברים ד', ח'; שמות ל"א, י"ח; ודה"א י"ו, כ"א.

110 הסמינים פה ובשורה 14 מורים שפסקא זו איננה במקומה הנכון ושייכת להלן דף ו',

ע"א, שו' 3-7.

111 היינו: חוקי התורה אינם טמונים בלבבות בני אדם כדברי הברהמאנים (למעלה דף ה',

ע"א בסוף), ועיין בהקדמה.

112 אות ד' מתוקנת למעלה במקום ט', היינו שצ"ל: הנפרדים.

113 פסקא זו קשה להבין, אולם משער אני פירוש זה. המחבר מדיש שמצוות התורה נתנו
 לשמור ולעשות בפה ובלב וכל ההרגשות החמשה. אלה האחרונות הן החושים החיצונים
 (הראות, השמע, הריח, הטעם, והמשיש; ועל אודותיהם השוה ספרו של קויפמן, *Die Sinne*,
 1884). תחת, ואחרית' כנראה צ"ל: ואחרות. היינו ד' הרגשות אחרות הנקראות החושים הפנימים
 (עיין שם' עמ' 45 והלאה, ומאמרו של וולפסון, *"The internal senses in Latin, Arabic and Hebrew Philosophic Texts"*
 1936), עמ' 69 והלאה). אמנם מספר החושים הפנימים הוא לפעמים ג' ולפעמים ה'. לפי
 מחברנו אלה ד' החושים, נרמם לארבעה המריחים בארבעה. פה ישנו איזה סימבוליסם שאיני
 מבין. החושים, הנפרדים לעשרה ונחשבים בעשרה (אולי הסכום הזה הוא מצורף מה'
 החיצונים, ד' הפנימים, ואחד שנקרא 'חוש משותף', עיי' וולפסון, שם, עמ' 103-104). הם דומים
 לעשרה (אולי המובן הוא י' הוקנים שעורו למוחמד בכתיבת הקוראן). על שומעי העשרה
 (היינו המוסלמים שקבלו קוראן זה של י' הוקנים). פירוש זה נראה לי מפני שמחברנו מוסיף
 למצוא רמז למוחמד, הנחשב מאצבעות עשרה חסף טינא (השוה דניאל ב', מ"א), ומן קרניא
 עשר קרן ועירא (השוה שם, ז', ז'-ח'). והנה כידוע, קרן ועירא' היה נדרש בתור רמז למלכות
 ישמעאל (עיין למשל בספרי *Texts and Studies* ח"ב, 75, הע' 9, ועמ' 192, והשוה
 שטיינשניידר *Polem u. Apolog. Literatur*, 308-310, 349). וגם, חסף טינא' היו מפרשים
 שהמובן הוא מלכות זו (השוה פירושו של יפת בן עלי לדניאל, הוצ' מרגליות, חלק הערבי,
 עמ' 29). מנהון חסף ומנהון פרול, פאלחדיד הם אלרום ואלפכאר הם אלערב' וכו', וחלק
 האנגלי, עמ' 13 והלאה). אמנם יש להודות שפירוש זה אינו מסיר עוד את כל הקושי שבפסקא
 זו, ומי שיבוא ויצליח לתת פירוש טוב ומקובל על הדעת הרי זה משובח.

114 צ"ל: עשה (השוה דברים כ"ז, י"ט).

- לחלה ולשם ולתפארת ועם קדוש כאשר
 5 דבר. ללמוד וללמד כל העמים חק ומשפט
 לנסותם באותותיה ומופתיה לדעת את אשר
 בלבכם הישמרו מצותיו אם לא.¹¹⁶ כי כל ק'
 קדושים בידינו והם תכו לרגלינו ישאו
 מדברות¹¹⁶ תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת
 10 יעקב.¹¹⁷ לא נח ולא קהלת אברהם ולא קהלת
 יצחק כי אם קהלת יעקב. להוציא שאר בני
 שאר בני^{117a} נח ושאר בני אברהם ככ' ולבני הפיל¹¹⁸
 הפילוגים אשר לאברהם נתן אברהם מתנות
 וישלחם מעל יצחק בנו.¹¹⁹ ולהוציא את שאר
 15 בני יצחק ככ' קום לך פדנה ארם.¹²⁰ ואל שדי
 יברך אותך. ויתן לך את ברכת אברהם.¹²¹ לך
 ולא לאחיק. ו[ל] זרעך אתך¹²² ולא לזרע אחיק. ואיזו היא
 ברכת אברהם הנתונה ליעקב ולזרעו ולא לאחרים
 עמם. זו היא שנאמר לאברהם ידוע תדע כי
 20 גר יהיה זרעך בארץ לא להם ועבדום וענו אתם.¹²³

דף ו', ע"ב

- להודיענו כי הזרע הגר המשעבד המעונה
 הוא הזרע [ה]מובחר הרצוי היורש את
 הארץ כל[ה]¹²⁴ מורש[ה]. ולעתיד יחזקו ב¹²⁵ ירושה
 ומורשה ונחלה. ולהוציא את ישמעאל ואחיו
 5 בני הפילגשים. ועל אשר נאמר לו תחלה
 כי ביצחק יקרא לך זרע.¹²⁶ ולהוציא את עשו
 ואלופיו שלא יבואו תחת כי ביצחק יקרא לך

¹¹⁵ הושה שם ח', ב'.

¹¹⁶ הושה שם, ל"ט, ט'.

¹¹⁷ שם, ד'.

^{117a} מכופלים בכ"י.

¹¹⁸ התחלת המלה הבאה.

¹¹⁹ בראשית כ"ה, ו'.

¹²⁰ שם, כ"ח, ב'-ג'.

¹²¹ שם, ד'.

¹²² שם.

¹²³ שם, ט"ו, י"ג.

¹²⁴ צ"ל: כלה.

¹²⁵ צ"ל: בה.

¹²⁶ שם, כ"א, י"ב.

זרע. 127 ונשאר יעקב וזרעו לבדם לאלהינו.
 וגם היא הנחלה שנא' 128 בה על ידי ישעיה הנביא
 10 זכ' צ' לב' 129 אז תתענג על יי והרכבתך על במתי
 ארץ והאכלתך נחלת יעקב אביך כי פי יי דבר. 130
 אשר הנחילו אלהינו מאבותיו יצחק ואב' 131 נחלה היא
 לו לבדו מורשה קהלת יעקב. הנקרא שמו יעקב
 וישראל מטרים ירות אבן פנה 132 ארץ ככ' 133 שמע
 15 אלי יעקב ויש' מקוראי אני הוא א[ני] ראשון אף
 אני אחרון. אף [ידי] יסדה ארץ [וימיני] טפונח[ה]
 שמים קורא אני אליהם יע [מדו יח] דו. הקבצו
 כלכם ושמעו מי בהם הגיד א[נת] אלה יי אהבו
 יעשה חפצו בב[נ]ל וזרעו כשדים. אני אני דברתי
 אף קראתיו[ו] הביאותי[ו] והצליח ד[נ]כו קרבו אלי

דף ז', ע"א

שמעו זאת לא מראש בסתר דברתי מעת
 היותה שם אני ועתה יי אלהים שלחני ורוחו.
 פשוטן 134 שמע אלי יעק' ויש' מקוראי מטרים
 קראתיו 135 לארץ ושמים ועמדו יחדיו. אף ידי
 5 יסדה ארץ אחרי קראתיו 136 לבני יעקב וימיני ט'
 טפחה שמים לרגל בכורי יש': מדרש ו'
 ופירושה 134 לא ממשמע שמע אלי יעק' השמיעה
 ליעקב לבדו ולא ממשמע וישר' מק' 137 הקריאה לו
 לבדו כי 137a ממשמע שמע אלי יע' ויש' מקוראי
 10 ידענו כי יעק' הוא יש' וממשמע מקוראי

127 עיין נדרים לא, ע"א: "והאיכא ישמעאל, כי ביצחק יקרא לך זרע כתיב. והאיכא עשו,
 ביצחק ולא כל יצחק", וירושלמי שם, ט', י"ב (דף ל"ח, ע"א, בסוף).

128 = שנאמרה.

129 זכר צדיק לברכה.

130 ישעיה נ"ח, י"ד.

131 = ואברהם.

132 צ"ל: פנת (השוה איוב ל"ח, ו'). עיי' ב"ר א', ד' (הוצ' תיאודור, עמ' 6, וש"נ): ו' דברים
 קדמו לבריית עולם, יש מהם שנבראו ויש מהם שעלו במחשבה להבראות... האבות עלו
 במחשבה להבראות... ישראל עלו במחשבה.

133 = ככתוב 'ישעיה מ"ח, י"ב-ט"ו).

134 היינו: של פסוקים אלה שבישעיה.

135 צ"ל: קריאתי, או: קראתי.

136 = קריאתי.

137 = וישראל מקוראי.

137a צ"ל: כי אם.

יתחזק ויאמן הדברים¹³⁸ הוא הקורא אותו יעקב
 ויש' מן וידו אוחות בעקב עשו¹³⁹ ומן כי שרית עם
 אלהים.¹⁴⁰ כי ביום הולד עשו ויעקב נאמר בעשו
 ויצא הראשון אדמוני¹⁴¹ כאשר שער ויקרא שמו
 15 אביו ואמו או אנשים אחרים עשו.¹⁴² ונאמר ביעקב'
 ואחרי כן יצא אחיו וידו אוחות בעקב עשו ויקרא
 שמו. אשר¹⁴³ האחיו ידו בעקב עשו¹⁴⁴ אחיו הוא אשר
 קרא שמו יעקב.¹⁴⁵ מגורת המעשה נקרא שמו יעקב.
 על כן אמר שמע אלי יעקב ויש' מק' אני הוא
 20 אני ראשון. אני הוא האומר לך כי אני ראשון לקרא
 לך יעקב ויש' תחלה. אף אני אחרון לקרא שמים

דף ז', ע"ב

וארץ אחרית.¹⁴⁶ כי היושב מודע¹⁴⁷ לפני בנות הבית
 וטרם עשות המקום לשבת. ודבר אחר.^{147a} אני
 הוא ואין זולתי. אני ראשון לקרואתך¹⁴⁸ לפני בראשית
 ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ ככ' לפני
 5 הארץ יסדת ומעשה ידך שמים.¹⁴⁹ אף אני אחרון
 להשכינך זולתם¹⁵⁰ בשעת איבודם וחילופם ככת'
 המה יאבדו ואתה וג' ואתה הוא ושנ' ל' ית'¹⁵¹ בני עבדיך

138 צריך להוסיף: כי.

139 בראשית כ"ה, כ"ו, וסופיה דקרא: ויקרא שמו יעקב.

140 שם, ל"ב, כ"ט, ורישיה דקרא: לא יעקב יאמר עוד שמך כי אם ישראל.

141 צריך להוסיף: כלו (שם, כ"ה, כ"ה).

142 עיי' באבן עזרא: ויקרא שמו, הקורא או יצחק אביו.

143 היינו: השם.

144 הנקודות מורות שהמלה מיותרת.

145 על אודות האנדה שהשם קרא שמו יעקב עיין ב"ר ס"ג, ח' (הוצ' תיאודור-אלבעק,

עמ' 692, וש"נ).

146 אי-ברור לי איפה נקראו בתנ"ך שמים וארץ בשם, אחרית. מרמורשטין (במאמרו הנ"ל,

עמ' 62, הע' 56) מצטט ישעיה מ"ו, י': מגיד מראשית אחרית, אבל מה ענינו של פסוק זה לכאן?

אולי צ"ל: אחרים, היינו, שמים חדשים וארץ חדשה (ישעיה ס"ה, י"ז). השוה הע' 150.

147 צ"ל: נודע, ואולי, "מודע"=מודיע, כלומר, "כי היושב" (היינו השם בעל-ביתו של העולם)

מודיע לפני בנות הבית, שבדעתו לבנות הבית הזה. אמנם, נודע' יותר מתאים.

147a היינו: פירוש אחר של הפסוקים בישיעה מ"ח, י"ב-ט"ז, שמחברנו דן עליהם.

148 כמו לקרואתך, או צ"ל: לקריאתך.

149 תהלים ק"ב, כ"ו.

150 צ"ל: בזולתם, היינו: בשמים ובארץ החדשים, בשעת איבודם וחילופם (של השמים

והארץ הראשונים).

151 =ושנותיך לא יתמו.

ישכנו חרעם לפניך יכון: 152 אף ידי יסדה ארץ
 וימיני טפחה שמ' 153 אחרי קריאתי ליע' 154 בני בכורי
 10 יש' 155 וקריאתי אליהם יעמדו יחדיו. ומשמע
 קורא אני אליהם יעמדו יחדיו הודיע כי קריאתו
 לכל המפעלים בפעם אחד וכקט מהרף עין המציא
 כל היצורים. הקבצו כלכם הראשונים והאחרונים
 ושמעו. מי בכסם 156 מי בשמים ובארץ הגיד את
 15 אלה כי אם י' אוהב את יש' לעשות חפצו בבבל
 וזרועו כשדים. אני אני הראשון בלא ראשית
 והאחרון בלא תכלית אשר דברתי זאת על בית
 יעקב. אף קראתיו יעקב ויש'. הביאותיו בעולם
 הזה בבחינה וכור עוני והצליח דרכו. ככת'
 20 וצרפתים כצרף את הכסף ובחנתים כבחון את
 הזהב הוא יקרא בשמי ואני אענה אתו אמרתי עמי

דף ח', ע"א

הוא והוא יאמר אלהי: 157 ובבני לוי נאמר כן וישב
 מצרף ומטהר כסף וטהר את בני לוי וחקק אותם
 כזהב וככסף והיו ליי' מגישי מנחה בצדקה.
 וערבה ליי' מנחת יהודה וירוש': 158 קרבו אלי שמעו
 5 זאת 159 בריתו אתנו רוחו אשר עלינו ודבריו אשר
 שם בפינו. אשר לא בסתר דבר במקום ארץ חשך
 ולא אמר לזרע יעקב תהו בקשונ' 160 ככ' לא מראש
 בסתר דברתי. מעת היותה שם אני. ואם ימדו שמים
 ויחקרו מוסדי ארץ 161 לא ימושו מפינו ומפי זרעינו
 10 זרע זרעינו מעתה ועד עולם. 162 לא זכרו אלה

152 שם, כ"ז-כ"ט.

153 =שמים.

154 =ליעקב.

155 השוה שמות ד', כ"ב.

156 צ"ל: בהם (ישעיה מ"ח, י"ד).

157 זכריה י"ג, ט'.

158 מלאכי ג', ג'-ד'.

159 מחברנו מפרש מלת "זאת" (ישעיה מ"ח, ט"ז) בחור רמז ל, ואני זאת בריחתי ונו' (שם,

נ"ט, כ"א).

160 השוה שם, מ"ח, י"ט.

161 השוה ירמיה ל"א, ל"ו.

162 השוה ישעיה נ"ט, כ"א.

האנשים¹⁶³ התועים מאחרי י' את ידו ואת אותותיו
אלה¹⁶⁴ ולא השכילו נפלאותיו ולא זכרו את רב חסדיו.¹⁶⁵
כי אם מהרו שכחו מעשיו וגברו והגבירו וה'¹⁶⁶
ורחקו והרחיקו מעלי¹⁶⁷ והיבדלו¹⁶⁸ והבדילו מקהלו
15 וצאן ידו ועם מרעיתו¹⁶⁹ ומנעו הטוב מהם ונתמנעו
מהחכמה ולא חפצו בתבונה¹⁷⁰ בהתגלות לבם ל'
למלאות תאותם לצאת חופש כפראים מלמדי¹⁷¹
מדבר וציה אשר באות נפשם שאפו רוח תא'
תאנתם מי ישיב כל מבקשים לא ייעפו בחדשם
20 ימצאום. ומרוב פתיותם וכסלותם הניחו א'
ארחות צדיקים לשמור ארחות עולם אשר דרכו

דף ח', ע"ב

מתי און¹⁷² ורגו במעו¹⁷³ ל[וצאן] מר[עית] וחס[ו] בצ[לל]
קיר נטוי גדר הדחוייה¹⁷⁴ יהמ... 174a... עם באל...
מרירת עמקי שפה ו[נלעגי] לשון... 175... אבו האשם^{175a}
וגבא י¹⁷⁶ וחביריהם אשר אינם יודעים שקול ומדור
5 ולא ישמע דבריהם. ולא [שמו] דברי י' לקו ומשפטיו
אשר צדקו יחדיו בפי הנביאים מקבלי ציוי הר
חורב למשקלת.¹⁷⁷ והנשאו להעמיד חזון ונכשלו¹⁷⁸

163 כאן חזר המחבר לאלה אשר הוא מתנגד לרעותיהם (עיין למעלה, הע' 86).

164 השוה דברים י"א, ב'-ג', ושמות י', א'.

165 השוה תהלים ק"ו, ז'.

166 צ"ל: ור', תחלת המלה הבאה.

167 צ"ל: מעליו.

168 צ"ל: והובדלו.

169 השוה תהלים צ"ה, ז'.

170 השוה ירמיה ה', כ"ה, ומשלי י"ח, ב'. וקודם, 'בהתגלות' צריך להוסיף: כי אם.

171 =מלומדי. וכל המשפט הזה הוא ע"פ הפסוק בירמיה ב', כ"ד.

172 השוה איוב כ"ב, ט"ו.

173 היינו: בה' אשר הוא מעו, 'לצאן מרעית' (עם ישראל).

174 השוה תהלים ס"ב, ד'.

174a אותיות אלה הן מטושטשות ומסופקות.

175 השוה ישעיה ל"ג, י"ט.

175a החלק התחתון של אות ו' מטושטש ונראה כיוד, אולם הקריאה אבו (Abū) היא נכונה.

176 על אודותיהם עיין בהקדמה.

177 השוה ישעיה כ"ח, י"ז.

178 השוה דניאל י"א, י"ד. כנראה פה הוא רמז שהאנשים האלה הקביעו את תאריך הקץ

ו'עיי' בהקדמה).

- והלכו אחור ונשברו ונוקשו ונלכדו: 179 כמה מהם היה 180 ממשש
 כאשר ימשש העור באפלה ולא הצליח דרכו ואמר
 10 כי ככה עשה י'י לנו. 181 וכן כתוב בתורתו 182 הית ממשש
 בצהרים כאשר ימשש העור באפלה ולא תצליח
 את דרכך. ולא ידע 183 כי דרך שלום לא ידעו ואין
 משפט במעגלותיהם נתיבותיהם עקשו להם כל
 דורך בה לא ידע שלום. 184 על כן יקוו לאור והנה
 15 השך לנגוהות באפילות יהלך 185 יגשש 186 כעורים קיר
 וכאין עינים יגשש 186 כשל 187 בצהרים כנשף באשמים
 כמתים
 המחברת הראשונה. ייחוד שם אלהינו ישתבח
 ויירום וינשא על כל הידות 188 כי הוא אחד בלא השנות
 20 ולא הקהל: אז תחלק המחברת הראשונה לשבע 189

דף ט', ע"א

לשבע מחלקות. 190 המחלוקת הראשונה מן המחברת
 הראשונה. מה האות והמופת להודות 191 להנחות 192 כי
 יש ליי אלהינו על כל מיני הממללים 193 הקוראים
 בשם יי תורה ודת ודין 194 בכתב וכל שכן על פה.

179 השוה ישעיה כ"ח, י"ג.

180 צ"ל: היה. ויותר נכון היה להשתמש בל"ר: היו.

181 כנראה המובן הוא שהאנשים האלה קובלים על ה' על שתאריך הקץ שלהם לא נתאמת.

182 דברים כ"ח, כ"ט, והית=והיית.

183 היינו שהאנשים האלה לא עמדו על האמת בתאריך הקץ שלהם.

184 השוה ישעיה נ"ט, ח'.

185 צ"ל: יהלכו, והשוה שם, ט'.

186 צ"ל: יגששו.

187 צ"ל: כשלו, והשוה שם, י'. אמנם כל השמוש הנ"ל בלשון יחיד הוא ע"י התחלת המשפט

ב, כמה מהם היה מגשש וכו' (ועיין למעלה הע' 180).

188 מנוקד כך בכ"י. אולם צ"ל: ההודיות.

189 השוה למעלה, הע' 34.

190 המובן הפשוט הוא 'פרקים'. אולם ע"י הכתיב 'מחלוקת' בלשון יחיד במלה הבאה

(ועיין שו' 6), ולא 'מחלקה', אפשר לפרש שהפרקים נסדרו באופן שאלה ותשובה כעין מחלוקת

בין שואל אנונימי ומשיב שהוא מחברנו. השוה סוף מחברת ב' (להלן דף י' ע"א, שו' 9-10):

'אמרו: ולמה אמרת כל זאת... השיבונו' וכו'. גם פה 'המחלוקת הראשונה מן המחברת

הראשונה' מתחילה בשאלה: 'מה האות והמופת' וכו'.

191 אפשר לקרוא: להורות.

192 היינו: לעשות הנחה.

193 עיין למעלה הע' 105.

194 במובן הערבי, כמו דת, אמונה.

- 5 וכי יש אלהים ותורה ביש' ותנתן דת בתוך בני יש' ותכתב אל כל עם ועם. ושמי המלקת הזאת לכל המחברות ומחלקותיהן כמפתח ורשות ומ' ומבוא הנקרא בלשון ישמעאלים מדכ"ל¹⁹⁶ ובלשון יוונים איסאגוגי¹⁹⁷ להוציא¹⁹⁸ חובת בני יש' הרבנים הנכספים לשמוע דברי אלהים חיים על כל הפנים אשר יפנו אליהם כל עם ועם בכל דור ודור. ושלא ליתן פתחון פה לכל יודעי דעת ומביני מדע ואשר כח בהם להבין ספרי עם ועם. וכל שכן מובדלי בני יש' 198 כאשר למדנו והזכירונו רבותינו ז"ל היו שקוד ללמוד מה שתשיב אפיקרס.¹⁹⁹
- 15 וכל שכן המינים הקוראים לנפשם קבאים.²⁰⁰ וכל שכן מקרי דרדקי שבתוך הרבונים היראים על אמונתם ופוחדים על תורתם שלא תשרף בתוך כור המצרף ותעוף בתוך²⁰¹ הבחינה. ולא ידע^{201a}

דף ט', ע"ב

- ולא הבינו²⁰² הנותן לנו תורת אמת והזכירו באומר²⁰³ ושמתם ועשיתם כי היא חכמתכם ובינתכם לעיני העמים אשר ישמעון את כל החקים האלה ואמרו רק עם חכם ונבון הגוי הגדול הזה: כי היא חכמתכם ובינתכם לבדכם 5 לא נאמר אלא לעיני העמים אשר ישמעון את הח' הא'.²⁰⁴ ולא עוד אלא אמרו²⁰⁵ רק עם חכם ונבון

¹⁹⁵ مدخل.

¹⁹⁶ εισαγωγή.

¹⁹⁷ צריך להוסיף: ידי.

¹⁹⁸ = ישראל, היינו: אלה האנשים שהבדילו את עצמם מתוך כלל ישראל ועיין למעלה, הע' 102). מחברנו מכניס אותם תחת סוג של אפיקורסים (שו' 15); הם שונים מן הקראים (שו' 16), ועיין בהקדמה.

¹⁹⁹ צ"ל: לאפיקורס, אבות ב', י"ד. וע"א הנוסחא פה עיין בד"ס לסנהדרין ל"ח, ע"ב (עמ' 107, הע' ב').

²⁰⁰ מנוקד כך בכ"י.

²⁰¹ כנראה צ"ל: מתוך (כבשן) הבחינה.

^{201a} היינו מקרי דרדקי אלה.

²⁰² צריך להוסיף: כי.

²⁰³ דברים ד', ו'.

²⁰⁴ = החקים האלה.

²⁰⁵ צ"ל: ואמרו.

הג' 206 הגדול הזה: כי מי גוי גדול אשר לו אלהים
קרובים אליו: ומי גוי גדול אשר לו חקים ומשפ'
10 צדיקים ככל התורה הזאת. 207 ולא בעבור ומ'
ומשמע דומה ומשא 208 וכל הדומה לו הכתוב
מדבר כי אם אשר לו חקים ומשפטים צדיקים.
ולא על הכתוב מהמפטים 209 והמשפטים והת'
והתורות הכתוב מדבר אשר כל יודע שפת הקדש
15 ולקרות בספר לשון בני עבר וקרא 210 בלהג ובשפת
חלק ובנעימת קול וכאשר יאמר 211 לו קרא נא זה
אמר לא אוכל כי חתום הוא 212 כי אם אשר לו
חקים ומשפטים צדיקים ככל התורה הזאת.
ואומר כי על פי הדברים האלה כרתי אתך 213
(בין דף ט' ודף י' ישנו ליקוי).

דף י', ע"א

גם 214 אלה גם השנים בכל עת ועת. ואחרי
תפלותם 215 התמודה אשר היא חובת הכל
כפי 216 תאותם והשגת כוחם. וכל איש אשר
ידבנו לבו וכפי נדרו אשר נדר להודות
5 להלל לשבח לפאר 217 על כל הטובה אשר הוסיף
לו מיטיבנו מן העושר והכבוד אשר העניקו
ועל שמחתו בכח ובנואי 218 ובבנים ובכל הון

206 =הנוי.

207 שם, ז'-ח'.

208 בראשית כ"ה, י"ד.

209 צ"ל: מהחוקים.

210 צ"ל: יקרא.

211 מנוקד כך בכ"י וועיין למעלה, הע' 33).

212 ע"פ הפסוק בישעיה כ"ט, י"א. וחתח, אמר' צ"ל: ואמר. המחבר מלגלג פה על מקרי

דרדקי, שהיו מתנגדי לחקירה בעניני הדת, על שמלמדים את תלמידיהם רק לקרוא את
התורה, "בנעימת קול" ולא להבין את תוכנה.

213 שמות ל"ד, כ"ז.

214 כאן הוא סופה של מחברת ב' מהספר שדנה על חובת התפלה ל"י. ובכן ישנו ליקוי

של כמה דפים מפני שבסוף דף ט' עוד לא נגמרה מחלוקת א' של ז' המחלוקות שבמחברת א'.

215 צ"ל: תפלותם; התמודה=התמידות, היינו התפלה הקבועה שבביל בן ישראל, כמו

שחרית, מנחה, וכו'.

216 כנראה שצ"ל: 'ניתפללו' כפי תאותם וכו'.

217 השוה הנוסח בתפלת, ובמקהלות רבבות עמך בית ישראל' בשחרית לשבת ויו"ט וועיין

סר"ע, הוצ' פרומקין, ח"ב, עמ' 48).

218 =ובנוי.

עתק, 219.

- אמר²²⁰ ולמה אמרת כל זאת אשר
 10 סדרת. השיבונו כי מדת²²¹ האמת והצדק
 חובה על כל הודאה המיטיב²²² חובה כ'
 כמדת הדין ופלס שיקול הדעת לכל²²³ המ'
 המועילים ולהקת²²⁴ המיטיבים. כי כל
 המוטב לו למיטיבו יהודה וכל המועל²²⁵
 15 למועילו ישבח וכל הקווי לקווי²²⁶ יהלל
 במשפט²²⁷ וצדקה וחוק וגזרה.
 המחברת השלישית. לבאר על כל²²⁸
 מצות י' ומשפטיו ועדותיו אשר צוה
 אלינו ביד משה מן היום אשר צוה י' והלאה

דף י', ע"ב

- לדורותינו²²⁹ לעשותם²³⁰ בכל הגוים אשר
 הדיחנו שם ולשוב עד י' אלהינו לשמוע
 בקולו ככל אשר צונו אותו היום אנחנו
 ובנינו בכל לבבנו ובכל נפשנו.²³¹ וכי חק
 5 חג²³² אלהינו לכל חקויו ולכל משפטיו בארץ
 וחוצה לארץ בשלוה ובגלות. כי כל תכלית
 הוא חוקר²³³ הראשונות מאז הגיד בטרם ת'

219 השוה משלי ח', י"ח.

220 עיין למעלה, הע' 190.

221 מן דת.

222 הסגנון לקוי וצ"ל: חובה על כל (המוטב לתת) הודאה למיטיב.

223 היינו: חובה היא לתת הודאה "לכל המועילים" וכו'.

224 כמו: וקהלת (השוה ש"א, י"ט, כ').

225 הקפצל של יעל (הועיל).

226 היינו: כל איש שהוא במצב של קווי (ובינוני פסיבי של קוה בקל) מהלל לאיש שהוא

במצב של קיווי (וכלומר שגורם לאחר לקוות), אולם בפעל אי-אפשר לעשות בינוני כזה. יותר
 נכון: וכל הקוה למקוהו יהלל. השוה רס"ג ב, אשא משלי (תרביץ ג', עמ' 388, והשוה ד', עמ'
 105, למטה): "חלילה לאל מהיות קוה בלתי מקוה, כי הקוה למועילו יקוה".

227 אולי צ"ל: כמשפט.

228 כמו: על אודות.

229 השוה במדבר ט"ו, כ"ג.

230 במחברת זו הנדון הוא שמצוות התורה נוהגות גם בארצות הגולה, נגד אלה שהחזיקו

בדעה שהן חלות רק בזמן שישבו ישראל על אדמתם (ועיין בהקדמה).

231 ע"פ הפסוק בדברים ל', א'-ב'.

232 השוה איוב כ"ו, י'.

233 השוה שם, כ"ח, ג'.

תצמחנה²³⁴ הודיעם אל עבדיו הנביאים ככ'
 כי לא יעשה יי' אלהים:²³⁵ וכי לא אל חנם בחרם
 10 מכל העמים היותם חבל ונחלה.²³⁶ ואף לא אל חנם
 הפיצם על פני כל הארץ.²³⁷ ולא מפני רוע מעלליהם
 הדיחם מעל אדמתם ולא מכבוד עונותיהם
 אזרם²³⁸ במזרה בשערי הארץ. כי אם לזאת²³⁹ ודבר
 אחר כאשר אנחנו עתידים לפרשם ולבאר [ם]
 15 היטב כאשר צונו יי' אלהינו²⁴⁰ וכאשר למדונו
 אבותינו יריאיו אשר גם אליהם גלה סודו
 ובריתו להודיעם.²⁴¹ אשרי דורכי²⁴² דרכימו
 מתהלך במהלכימו מסליל במסלולימו מ'
 מנתיב בנתיבותימו מעגל במעגלותימו
 (כאן סוף העמוד).

²³⁴ השוה ישעיה מ"ח, ג', ומ"ב, ט'.

²³⁵ עמוס ג', ז', וסופיה דקרא: דבר כי אם גלה סודו אל עבדיו הנביאים.

²³⁶ השוה דברים י"ד, ב', ולי"ב, ט'.

²³⁷ ע"פ הפסוק בבראשית י"א, ט'.

²³⁸ עיין ירמיה ט"ז, ז', אולם פה צ"ל: זרם.

²³⁹ היינו מפני טעם אחד שמחברנו מזכיר במחברת זו (בחלק שחסר לפנינו), ומפני טעם אחר שמבטיח להזכיר להלן בספרו. ועל אודות דעתו שגלות עם ישראל לא היתה "מפני רוע מעלליהם" . . . ולא מכבוד עונותיהם" עיין בהקדמה.

²⁴⁰ היינו: כמו שאפשר להוציא מדברי השם בתורתו.

²⁴¹ השוה תהלים כ"ה, י"ד. כנראה המחבר רומז פה לחכמי ישראל שקדמוהו אשר פרשו ענין הגלות באופן כזה. ומפני שהוא הולך בעקבותיהם, הוא מוסיף: "אשרי דורכי דרכימו" וכו'.
²⁴² צ"ל: דורך.

APPENDIX

Concerning Serene (Serenus) and the "Minim" in two Gaonic Responsa.

The famous and much discussed responsum, alluded to above, p. 412, begins (Lewin, *אוצר הגאונים*, VII [to Yebamot], p. 113, No. 262): וששאלהם: יש בינינו מקום אחד של מינין שצוחקים מישראל ופירשו: מדרכי ישראל, ואין משמרין לא מצות עשה ולא מצות שבת, ואין שוחטין כשחיטתנו, ואוכלים חלב ודם וי"ח טרפות, ופרוצים בעריות, ואין כותבין כתובות ולא גטין, ולא חולצין ולא מיבמין. ויש מבניהם שמבקשים לחזור לישראלים ולהיות נוהגין כדיני ישראל. יש תקנה לחזרתן, וכשהם חוזרין צריכין טבילה או לא? וכו'.

The Gaon in his reply characterizes these heretics as different from all the rest who only broke with rabbinic Judaism but kept the biblical laws: כך ראינו שאותם מינין משונים הם מכל מינים שבעולם, וכוונן שכל מינים פוקרים בדברי חכמים, כגון טרפות, וכוונן י"ט שני דרבנן, וכוונן שניות מדברי סופרים, אבל בדברי תורה ומקרא מחזיקין ומשמרים. והללו שפירשתם פקרו בעיקר תורה, ונשאו עריות והולידו בנים ממזרים, וחללו שבתות. ואלו לא היה עקרם מישראל, היינו חושבים אותם (גוים) כשאר גוים שמתניידים וטובלים ונעשים כשאר ישראל... אבל הללו כיון שעקרון מישראל ועדיין שם ישראל עליהם, ומצות נוהגות בהם וכו'. (ובכן: עוד החזיקו באלו מצות, אולם אפשר לפרש שהמצות חלות עליהם בתור בני ישראל, כמו שהולך ומוסיף: „והיו מחוייבין בתרי"ג מצות".)

This responsum is attributed in 3 different sources (see *ibid.*, note 3) to R. Moses, R. Naṭronai and R. 'Amram respectively. All three were Geonim at Sura, viz. the first in c. 832–42, the second (b. R. Hilai) entered upon his office in c. 853, and after a few years had as a rival Gaon R. 'Amram who finally succeeded him; the latter died in c. 874.

The matter of the authorship of this responsum, and consequently the period when these "Minim," or *rather particularly some of their children*, wished to return to traditional Judaism, has become complicated by reason of the allusion in this responsum to a previous one concerning other heretics who, too, wanted

והו יודעין: (ibid., p. 114) "Kelal Yisrael" שכלפני שאלות אלו יצאו שאלות לפנינו שבאו משם (ובכן: מאותה עיר או מדינה שממנה הגיעה השאלה בנדרון שלפנינו) כתוב בהן שאלה דומה לזו ומפורש בה: שיש בני אדם שיצאו לתרבות רעה ולמינות, ופקרו בדברי חכמים, ואין כותבין כתובות וגו' כן כישראל, ועכשו יש מהם (ובכן: לא, מבניהם" כבחושה הראשונה) שרוצים לחזור בהם ולהיות כישראל, ולפרוש מן הדרכים אשר היו בהם, כיצד נעשה: נקבלם או לא? וכו'.

Now this reference is evidently to the other, equally famous, responsum concerning the followers of a Pseudo-Messiah, called ושאלתם בשביל מטעה שעמד בגלותינו: (ibid., p. 113, No. 261) ושריני שמו, והיה אומר: אני משיח, ותעו אחריו בני אדם ויצאו למינות, ואין מתפללין תפלה, ואין רואין את הטרפה, ואינם משמרים את יינם משום יין נסך, ועושין מלאכה ביו"ט שני, ואין כותבין כתובות כתיקון חז"ל, כגון אלו, שיש בידם מינות הרבה, כשהן חוזרין צריכין טבילה או לא וכיצד התרתן? . . . ועוד אותו מטעה התיר להן עריות (היינו: שניות מדברי סופרים), וכו'.

Graetz (V⁴, 169–72, 457–60) identified this שריני with the Pseudo-Messiah "Serenus" in Syria (about 720), and hence the Gaon in question, viz. R. Naṭronai, was taken to mean the much earlier one of Pumbedita, Mar R. Naṭronai b. Mar Nehemiah, who assumed his office in 719 (1030 Sel., see Sherira's *Letter*, ed. Lewin, p. 102). Weiss (ד"ר, IV⁶, 104–05) rightly challenged this identification both as to שריני (whom he, however, wrongly turned into a Ḳaraite) and as to Naṭronai. But later writers uphold the first half of the theory while rejecting the second one, thus attributing both responsa to R. Naṭronai b. Hilai of Sura.¹ This solution is certainly untenable. The argument of Brüll (and also of Ginzberg who, however, does not cite Brüll) that R. Naṭronai (b. Hilai) was consulted concerning Serene's followers of a later period is disproved by the clear context of the second responsum referring to a false Messiah who misled a number of people; after the fiasco the *latter* wished to resume their allegiance to Rabbinic Judaism. If this Serenus started his movement *over 130 years before the time of R. Naṭronai*, there certainly would have been an

¹ Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IX, 119; Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 50, note 1; Friedlaender, *JQR.*, NS., I, 210–11.

allusion in the question to the fact that *the descendants* of the original followers asked now for readmission. In the first responsum concerning the still more radical "Minim," who even rejected biblical Judaism, there is a particular mention of their children (ויש מבניהם)^{1a} who were ready to return to the fold. How much more would such an item (viz. ויש מורעם or ויש מבני בניהם) be expected in the former case?

We have to dissociate שריני from Serenus. The latter's name as such is altogether problematic (cp. Krauss, *Studien z. byz.-jüd. Gesch.*, 38, note 3). Whatever his real name may have been, there is no evidence that he advocated changes in rabbinic Judaism. He merely was a Messianic pretender. His movement is to be connected with the great excitement that prevailed then as a repercussion of the mighty onslaught in 717–18 on Constantinople by the forces of the Caliph Sulaimān. The great struggle between Ishmael (Islām) and Edom (Byzantium) was construed in Jewish circles as about to usher in the Messianic age (about this more in another connection).

On the other hand the Pseudo-Messiah שריני, mentioned in the responsum of R. Naṭronai b. Hilai (it is also attributed to R. 'Amram, just as the first one about the more radical heretics), belongs to the middle of the 9th century. Pozn.² may be right in his suggestion that for שריני there should be read שיריני, viz. from Shirin near Kirmasīn in Persia. The latter country was fertile soil for the spread of Jewish sectarianism. Thus this pretender combined with his Messianism also changes in Rabbinic law because his environment was conducive to such changes. After his fiasco a number of his misguided followers were in a repentant mood, and the question of their readmission was submitted to

^{1a} It is true that a variant reading is מבניהם, but מביניהם is more correct since in the responsum the latter are referred to (בניהם ממורים ואי אפשר לקבלם וכו') (cp. *JQR.*, VIII, 699, note 1; *Reshumot*, I, 207, note *).

² *JQR.*, VIII, 699, note 1; *Reshumot*, I, 207, note *. Friedlaender's suggestion (*l. c.*, note 104) that טוריאני=שריני (the Syrian) is far-fetched (cp. also Hirschfeld, *ibid.*, 447), and moreover cannot be maintained since this שריני in the Gaonic responsum cannot be identical with the earlier Pseudo-Messiah "Serenus" of Syria.

R. Naṭronai (or R. 'Amram). At the same time there arose the problem as to what to do with the children of the still more extreme heretics who, too, desired to return to the fold. The origin of this group, viz. their *parents*, is to be placed in the first half of the 9th century.

Here enters an important consideration, not yet touched upon before, as to why in the time of R. Naṭronai or R. 'Amram, say in the 6th decade of this century, we notice this tendency on the part of former non-conformists to rejoin the larger group of traditional Jews. The answer is to be sought in the political situation as it obtained during the reign of the then ruling 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Mutawakkil (847-61). His was a reign of extreme reaction after a period of liberalism, especially under al-Mamūn (813-33). The latter favored the study of Greek philosophy and the exact sciences, followed the Mu'tazila school of thought and was surrounded by rationalist court-theologians. This policy was also continued under al-Wāthiq (842-47). But al-Mutawakkil, in order to strengthen his position, favored orthodoxy and there started a regime of heresy-hunting. Freedom of thought was suppressed. He also introduced discriminatory social laws against the *dhimmis*, viz. Christians and Jews.³ This situation had a repercussion among Oriental Jewry too. Former "Minim" found it advisable, or they did it under pressure, to rejoin the fold of orthodox Judaism, especially since they were also subject to the same humiliating laws as to distinctive garb, exclusion from government service, etc., as the rest of their fellow-Jews. The Babylonian Exilarchate had also suffered a severe defeat in about 825 when, as a result of a conflict between two rival candidates for the office, al-Mamūn decreed that each religious party had a right to appoint its own official head. As one chronicler puts it: "si decem cujuscumque religionis viri in unum congregati antistitem sibi creare vellent, sive Christiani sint, sive Judaei, vel

³ See A. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- u. Abendland*, I, 508 ff., 513 ff., 524-26; Huart, *Gesch. d. Araber*, I, 300-01, 303-04. Cp. also Tritton, *The Caliphs and their Non-Muslim Subjects* (1930), 23, 50-51, 107, 118-19, 167. See further Dubnow, *Weltgesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, III, 433-5.

Magi, id ipsis fas esse.”⁴ Such an edict, however liberal and tolerant, was bound to disrupt the strong communal organization of Babylonian and Persian Jewries. It certainly aided the formation of “heretical” groups who could no longer be coerced into conformity by the political power of the Exilarchate. We are not informed as to how long al-Mamūn’s order prevailed. But it stands to reason that al-Mutawakkil’s reactionary policies, which aimed at orthodox conformity within Islām, also aided the Jewish communal leaders, if not the Exilarchate itself, in asserting their authority so as to combat the continued existence of the smaller heterodox groups within Jewry. Both moral and mundane pressure must have been exerted to bring about their dissolution. The result was that a number of these “Minim,” who were also affected psychologically by the trends of the environment then prevailing, sought to return to traditional Judaism, as apparent from the two Gaonic responsa under discussion.

How far these events impinged upon the larger schismatic group of Ḳaraïtes, we are unable to say. As Ḳaraism was legalized in the Caliphate already since a considerable time, it probably was able to hold its ground. It even sought to enlarge its scope by means of its energetic center in Jerusalem and to reach out to the Jewries in Syria and Egypt, and even beyond.⁵ That the reaction against employing philosophy and science in matters of religion also penetrated into Ḳaraite circles, is evident from the attitude of Daniel al-Kūmīsī, a contemporary of the Geonim R. Naṭronai and R. ‘Amram of Sura. As Ḳirḳisānī reports of him, he opposed speculation by means of pure reason and despised its followers.⁶ In his Tract⁷ he denounces “extraneous” sciences

⁴ About this episode cp. Graetz, V⁴, 220–21, 444–46. See also Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jew. Hist. and Lit.*, II, 129–30, for a rectification of some of Graetz’s remarks.

⁵ See *Texts and Studies*, II, 3 ff.

⁶ Ed. Harkavy, 316, l. 16: אול דלך אנכארה ללונטר פי אלמעקול ואעאבחה לאהלה; ניר אנה למ ירחץ פי אלמעקול בל ינכרה ויעיב אהלה פי כחבא כחירא; see also p. 280, l. 13: כחבא כחירא פי אהלה ויעיב אהלה פי כחבא כחירא (cp. also *HUCA.*, VII, 321 and 390).

⁷ *JQR.*, NS., XII, 273 (cp. now *Texts and Studies*, II, 5).

which, according to him, only corrupt the religious.⁸ This anti-rationalistic attitude was taken over by the Ḳaraïtes of Shustar (Tustar) in Persia.⁹ Also Salman b. Yerūḥam inveighs against "the extraneous writings."¹⁰ Of course, similar views were shared by numerous traditional Jews. However, this conflict between conservatism and rationalism cannot be discussed here at length. The main point was to uncover the inter-relationship between the situation prevailing in the Caliphate under al-Mutawakkil and the affairs within Oriental Jewry as they concerned, in particular, certain groups of "Minim" of those days.

ואל תתעו בדברים החיצונים דברי בראני שקר ותפלה תועבת יי"י כי דברי בראני⁸
השחית לרבים עד היום הזה, וכו'.

⁹ See Ḳirkisānī, *l. c.*, 279, l. 12 ff. (cp. *HUCA.*, VII, 320-21).

¹⁰ כתב אלבראני¹⁰ (cp. *JQR.*, NS., XII, 273, note 150).

ON THE DATE OF THE COMPLETION OF THE MOREH NEBUKIM

Z. DIESENDRUCK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati

TRADITION, as recorded by Zacut¹ and others who followed him,² has it that the *Moreh Nebukim* was completed by Maimonides some time close to his fiftieth year. This would mean around the year 1185, if we disregard, of course, the mistaken statement of Zacut as to the year of Maimonides' birth.³ Since Graetz,⁴ this date has been moved up to 1190, which date again was repeated by almost all historians and biographers of Maimonides.⁵ Recently Marx⁶ introduced a new date, that of around 1197; and this date also is being accepted by others.⁷ Both theories are based mainly on the correspondence of Maimonides; a discussion of their validity must, therefore, involve a critical examination of certain parts of the extant correspondence and an analysis of the probable relationship of the individual letters within these parts.

¹ *Yuhasin* ed. Filipowski, p. 219b: אבל ספר המורה עשה בזכותו קרוב מחמשים שנה.

² So Gedalya ibn Yahya, *Šalšelet Haḳabbalah*, ed. Cassel, p. י"ב, and Conforte, *Ḳore Hadorot*, Warsaw 1881 p. 19b (comp. Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1894). See also Edelman, *Ḥemda Genuzah* p. XV.

³ See Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1894; Geiger's statement, (*Wiss. Zeitschr. f. Jüd. Theol.* I [1835] p. 420) about the "gewöhnliche freilich durch Nichts besonderes gestützte Annahme" that the *Moreh* was completed in 1184, may well, as Steinschneider surmises, be based on Zacut's statement with regard to the *Moreh*, although without accepting Zacut's erroneous date of birth.

⁴ *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4th ed., vol. 6, p. 309.

⁵ Comp. Steinschneider *loc. cit.*, also *Hebr. Uebers.* p. 414. Also Epstein in *Moses ben Maimon* II, p. 86; Münz, *Moses b. Maimon* p. 172.

⁶ "The Correspondence between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides etc." in *HUCA* III, p. 331 n. 33. Also "Texts by and about Maimonides" in *JQR.*, NS XXV p. 385 f.

⁷ So e. g., Zeitlin, *Maimonides* p. 163 who even speaks of a "proof of the fact that the work was completed later than 1190," this, however, in contradiction to his statement on p. 110, in which he apparently still follows Graetz.

The problem before us concerns not only the exact date of the completion of the *Moreh Nebukim* — here we have to be satisfied with merely a terminus ad quem — but the wider implications of these theories as to Maimonides' method of work and his procedure in publication. According to both theories Maimonides published the book piecemeal, beginning long before it was finished. Graetz supports his dating by the passage in the letter to Ibn-Aknin,⁸ where Maimonides writes that he is sending Ibn-Aknin six installments of the *Moreh* which conclude the first part. This should prove that at that time not more of the book had been written. Yet we see from the same letter that Maimonides had already had parts of the book copied for others than his disciple.⁹ This piecemeal method of publication is still more to be assumed in the theory of Marx, according to which it appears that Maimonides for a period of some eight years constantly referred to his book,¹⁰ showed it to a non-Jewish visitor¹¹ and let it become well-known in Egypt¹² — all this while only the first two parts of the book were ready.

Such a procedure of publication in installments would not only throw an unfavorable light upon the attitude of Maimonides to his *magnum opus* but would be in peculiar contradiction to his assertions of the careful organization of the book¹³ and of the interrelation of all its various parts, which supplement one another.¹⁴ It would also fail to agree with the emphatic warning to his disciple, in the same passage quoted by Graetz, not to

⁸ See Munk, *Notice sur Joseph Ben-Jehouda*, p. 23 and p. 26.

⁹ Munk, *ibid.*

¹⁰ So in letter on Astrology, s. Marx, "The Correspondence etc.," p. 353 l. 6; again in the *Treatise on Resurrection* — which we shall discuss later in detail — in several places.

¹¹ To the Arab physician Abdullatif ca. 1189, s. De Sacy, *Relation de l'Egypte par Abd-allatif* 1810, p. 465 f. We shall return to this point later.

¹² Jonathan in his letter accompanying the questions on *Mišneh-Torah*, *Kobez* I p. 64, (Freimann, *Tešubot Ha-rambam* p. LV): להשיעני עוד בספר מורה הנבוכים אשר שמענו שמעו ובארץ מצרים יצא טבעו.

¹³ So Introduction (ed. Wilna) p. 9: כי המאמר הזה לא נפלו בו הדברים כאשר נודמן אלא ברקדוק גדול ובשקידה רבה . . . ולא נאמר בו דבר בוולת מקומו.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: כשתרצה להעלות בידך כל מה שכללו פרקי זה המאמר . . . השב פרקיו זה (and later, 9b: (ולא יהרוס ויקפוץ עצמו להשיב על דברי על זה וכשיסתכל בו מי שחבר לו זה המאמר ויתבונן בפרקיו כלם בהשגחה שלמה יתבאר לו הענין כלו

show the book to either Jews or non-Jews because of the danger of misinterpretation.¹⁵ In view of all this we would rather expect that Maimonides withheld the book from the public for years after it had been finished. Therefore those who maintain the theory of publication in installments — the *onus probandi* is on them.

Beginning now with the most extreme dating, that of Marx, we find that this conjecture is based solely on the fact that Maimonides sent to the scholars of Lunel the third part of the *Moreh* separately and some time later than the first two parts. The third part was sent together with the responsa in connection with the *Mišneh Torah*, 1510 Sel. = 1198–1199. There is also a letter extant from Jonathan of Lunel in which he asks for the third part, and a similar request must have reached Maimonides from another group of scholars in Lunel. This indicates, according to Marx, that the third part was not yet ready when the first two were sent.

The conjectured date of Marx is definitely refuted by a more careful examination of the *Treatise on Resurrection* as we shall see later. Yet it may be of use to clarify this point on the basis of the correspondence itself. Although unnecessary for the purpose of dating, this clarification provides an opportunity to make a clearer and more organized survey of the scattered correspondence between Maimonides and the scholars of Lunel and thus to forestall other possible mistaken conjectures. Our immediate interest is the question: what was the time-interval between the request of the Lunel scholars for the third part and the receipt of this part? Or what was the approximate time which elapsed between the sending of the first two parts and the third? Is this interval long enough to warrant the assumption that in it the writing or even the finishing up of the third part of the *Moreh* took place, or does it rather justify the assumption of mere delay in the copying of this part of the book? We shall see that only the latter is possible. Yet for a correct estimation a brief survey of the entire correspondence appears necessary.

¹⁵ Munk, *Notice* p. 23 (transl. p. 27) on the dangerous רשעי ישראל and גוים. Comp. Goldberg *Birk. Abr.* p. IX.

Of this correspondence with the scholars of Lunel, including Samuel Ibn Tibbon, eight items are extant, only four of which have dates. The items are: (1) the letter on the question of Astrology,¹⁶ (2) Maimonides' answer on Astrology (dated 1507 Sel.=1195),¹⁷ (3) Jonathan's letter with questions on the *Mišneh Torah* and the request for the *Moreh*,¹⁸ (4) Jonathan's letter acknowledging receipt of the two parts of the *Moreh* and requesting the third,¹⁹ (5) the reply of Maimonides to his questions on the *Mišneh Torah* accompanied by part III of the *Moreh* (dated 1510 Sel.=1198),²⁰ (6) the letter by Samuel Ibn Tibbon on providence (dated 1510 Sel.=1199),²¹ (7) Maimonides' reply to Ibn Tibbon,²² (1199), (8) Maimonides' reply to the Lunel group.²³

These eight items, however, must be supplemented by five more, non-extant but necessarily inferred from the contents of the correspondence; and by this supplementation the approximate dates of the undated letters may be more closely suggested. The supplementary items are: (a) between (2) and (3) there must have been a letter by Jonathan to Maimonides, since in (3) Jonathan neither mentions his first letter (1) as unanswered nor does he acknowledge the receipt of Maimonides' answer on Astrology (2); and that he would pass over such an elaborate epistle by Maimonides without the slightest reference to it is, of course, out of the question.²⁴ There might have been

¹⁶ Marx, "Correspondence" (s. above n. 6) p. 343.

¹⁷ *Ḳobez* II p. 24, Marx, "Correspondence" p. 349.

¹⁸ S. above n. 12.

¹⁹ Wertheimer, *מני ירושלים* I p. 33.

²⁰ *Ḳobez* I p. 121, Freimann, *Tešubot* p. LVIII.

²¹ Ed. Amsterdam p. 12a, *Ḳobez* II p. 26. I have published the full letter from the MS in my article "Samuel and Moses Ibn Tibbon on Maimonides' Theory of Providence," *HUCA* XI, p. 341 f.

²² Ed. Amst. p. 12a, *Ḳob.* II 27ⁱ. This letter as contained in the MS Oxford is still to be fully published.

²³ *Ḳob.* II p. 44; Wertheimer, *op. cit.* p. 35.

²⁴ Since Maimonides, in his Letter on Astrology, mentions the fact that the Lunel scholars have not yet seen his *Mišneh-Torah* (Marx, "Correspondence," p. 349, 3), we should also expect some reference to the receipt of this book, either from Maimonides or from another source, in Jonathan's letter; yet any such reference is missing.

also a reply of Maimonides to this letter, but here we have no support for such an assumption. (b) Between (3) and (4) Maimonides sent the two parts of the *Moreh* whether or not accompanied by a note, we do not know. (c) A letter of the Lunel group to Maimonides, to which Maimonides' letter (8) is the reply.²⁵ (d—e) Two letters, at least, by Samuel Ibn Tibbon to Maimonides, to which he refers in his letter on providence (6).²⁶

Put in the proper order and numbered consecutively all the items of the correspondence, extant or necessary as supplements, were therefore as follows:

- I. Letter by Jonathan on Astrology;
- II. Maimonides' answer on Astrology (1195–1196);
- (III. Letter of acknowledgement by Jonathan);
- IV. Letter with questions on *Mišneh Torah* by Jonathan;
- (V. Sending of two parts of *Moreh Nebukim* by Maimonides);
- VI. Letter by Jonathan acknowledging receipt of the parts of *Moreh Nebukim* with request for the third;
- (VII. Letter by Lunel group on *Moreh Nebukim*);
- (VIII–IX. Two letters by Samuel Ibn Tibbon on *Moreh Nebukim*);
- X. Maimonides' answer to Jonathan on *Mišneh Torah* (Sept. 1198, also part III of *Moreh Nebukim*);
- XI. Letter by Samuel Ibn Tibbon on providence (March 1199);
- XII. Maimonides' reply to Ibn Tibbon (Sept. 1199);
- XIII. Maimonides' reply to the Lunel group.

We have now to determine the approximate time of the letters VI and VII and the relationship of their dates to V. We

²⁵ The letter, s. above n. 23, begins: הניעו אלינו כתביכם הראשונים והאחרונים ועליהם החומים האנשים אשר נקבו בשמות וכו'. None of the extant letters has the signatures of the Lunel scholars to which Maimonides refers.

²⁶ Amst. p. 12a, *Ḳob.* II p. 26. Comp. my "Samuel and Moses ibn Tibb." p. 341 n. 3.

have by internal evidence two limits. These letters could not have been written after the receipt of X, because with this letter there arrived also the third part of *Moreh Nebukim*, therefore the request for this part would be senseless. They also could not have been written long before the receipt of X (so that Maimonides would have received it before he wrote X), because Maimonides would have answered in this very letter the questions of the Lunel group²⁷ and from his reply it is evident that when he received the Lunel letter he had already forwarded the third part.²⁸ Hence these letters and Maimonides' letter to Jonathan (X) must have *crossed*, i. e., they also must have been written in 1198. Or, in other words, at the time when Jonathan acknowledged the receipt of the two parts of the *Moreh Nebukim* the third part was on its way to Jonathan. Now, since between the receipt of the two parts and their acknowledgment, without any apology by Jonathan,²⁹ there could have elapsed only some

²⁷ This all the more since to write letters was to Maimonides quite a strenuous matter at that time; he writes, *Kob.* II p. 44: ... סבות הזמן סבבוני ... חי נפשכם אלופי ומידעי אפי' לכתוב פרשה קטנה אין לי פנאי לא ביום ולא בלילה ומפני כבוד הצבור צערתי עצמי וטרחתי לכתוב כתב זה כלו בכתב ידי.

²⁸ In this letter, *Kob. loc. cit.*, Maim. refers to the letter (X) to Jonathan and adds הנבוכים ממורה השלישי החלק החתב עם זה הכתב ... — A reference is also made to the letter XII to Samuel ibn Tibbon (of Sept. 1199): וכבר כתבתי לו כתב בכתב ידי ... על עסקי ההעקקה.

²⁹ Maimonides in his letter X to Jonathan gives a lengthy explanation as to why his reply was delayed כמה שנים, namely המהומות ומרוב החולי. These two facts, namely the apology of Maimonides and the lack of an apology on the part of Jonathan, when considered together, are also of importance for our dating problem. If we assume, as seems to be quite plausible, that Maimonides did not send the two parts of the *Moreh* during the severe illness and the great disturbances, then he must have sent them only after his recovery, because if he had sent them before the beginning of his illness, then Jonathan, too, would have waited those כמה שנים before acknowledging the receipt of the two parts — and the lack of any apologetic explanation for his delay would hardly be understandable. Furthermore, if we are right in assuming that Jonathan acknowledged the receipt of the Astrology letter in a separate non-extant letter (III) then his letter with the questions on the *Mišneh-Torah* (IV) must be moved up still further and could have been written only some time in 1197, so that, if we take the כמה שנים in Maimonides' explanation of 1198 literally — about the illness he says clearly: כמו שנה — עמדתי בחליי ועכשיו שנתרפאתי הרי אני כחולה שאין בו סכנה — then this letter IV must have reached Maimonides when he was already gravely ill. Then he

months, these months then are to be assumed as the period between the sending of the two parts and that of the third — a period which is understandable as a delay in the copying of the third part but which certainly does not warrant the assumption that it was written or completed during this time.

In view of these considerations we may try now to conjecture the approximate time of these letters — extant and non-extant — for which we have no dates. If we assume that the letter III was written sometime early in 1196, the date of letter IV would be later in the same year. Then came the "several years," the intermission because of Maimonides' illness; V then must have taken place early in 1198. Following this come VI and VII in the middle of 1198 (crossing X), and about the same time (or perhaps even before V?) the Tibbon letters VIII and IX. The letter XIII, although referring to XII of 1199, should nevertheless not be put later than 1200.

Another reason against the late dating of the completion of the *Moreh Nebukim* presents itself from Tibbon's extant letter XI of March 1199. In this letter Tibbon refers to at least two previous letters (in our list VIII and IX) of his to Maimonides, in which he has asked questions concerning all the three parts of the *Moreh Nebukim*.³⁰ This last letter (XI) was written immediately after the receipt of Maimonides' letter to Jonathan (X) which accompanied the third part, hence the letters referred to must have been written before that³¹ and we see that Tibbon, long before Jonathan received the third part, was in possession of it and had studied it carefully and asked the author a number

certainly could have sent the two parts of the *Moreh* only after his recovery. And if the two parts of the *Moreh* were sent after his recovery, there could have elapsed only a short period between the sending of the two parts and the writing of letter X, with which he sent also part III of the *Moreh*.

³⁰ Ed. Amst. p. 12a, *Ḳob*. II p. 26⁴: וְהָאֵפֶסֶר פִּי מִיחֹל לְמַלְקוֹשׁ חֲשׂוֹבוֹחִי . . . עַל כָּל אֲשֶׁר שְׁאַלְחִי . . . בְּשֵׁלֶשֶׁת חֳלָקֵי הַמֶּאֱמָר הַנִּכְבֵּד מוֹרֵה הַנְּבוֹכִים.

³¹ This according to my theory, "Samuel and Moses Ibn-Tibbon etc." p. 342, that the phrase in Samuel's letter 'וכ' עברו כתבו היקר וכ' refers to Maimonides' letter to Jonathan. According to Marx, "Correspondence" p. 334, who assumes some "preliminary" note of Maimonides to Samuel, before letter X to Jonathan, the last letter of Samuel, and consequently also the two preceding ones, were written even earlier.

of questions regarding it. Also in the reply (XII) to Tibbon, in which there is no reference to Tibbon's last letter (XI) but only to his previous questions, Maimonides says distinctly that he is going to answer all the questions concerning the first, second, and third parts.³² Moreover, in his last letter (XI) Tibbon was already in possession of two copies of the third part, one of which Tibbon regards as a transcription from a copy written in Arabic characters,³³ which means a copy that has undergone *two* transcriptions, one from the original Hebrew characters into Arabic — this against Maimonides' strict prohibition³⁴ — and again back into Hebrew characters. All this Tibbon had studied and compared carefully and as a result he sent a copy to Maimonides for revision immediately after Jonathan received letter X. These facts seem to be sufficient proof that long before Jonathan received the third part of the *Moreh Nebukim* there had been in circulation complete copies of the book. The delay, therefore, in the sending of the third part to Jonathan is of no relevance at all.

Yet, decisive and disposing of all speculations as to a later date of completion of the *Moreh* is a closer examination of the contents of the *Treatise on Resurrection*, whose date is certain — 1502 Sel. = 1190–91.³⁵ Many places in the *Treatise* are either based on part III of the *Moreh* or refer expressly to this part.

The discussion about the impossible by reason and the impossible by nature נמנע מצד השכל ונמנע ממנהג הטבע (*Ḳob.* II, 11¹) is undoubtedly based upon *MN* (ed. Wilna) III, 15 p. 21b. The statements about the decree of God's Wisdom, גזרת החכמה, a term of systematic importance³⁶ (*Ḳob.* 11⁴) — וזה כלל נחלה

³² *Ḳob.* II p. 27³: והנני מתחיל עתה להשיב לך . . . על סדר מה שבא בכתבך החלק הראשון גם את השני גם את השלישי.

³³ *Ḳob.* II p. 27².

³⁴ See the report by Abdullatif in De Sacy *loc. cit.* (n. 11); comp. also Derenburg in Geiger's *Wiss. Zeitschrift* vol. I (1835) p. 420.

³⁵ *Treatise*, *Ḳob.* II p. 8⁴: וכאשר הייתה בואה השנה, אתק"ב לשטרות. As to the use of the date of the *Treatise* for the earlier dating of the *Moreh* as "ein fertiges und verbreitetes Buch", comp. Geiger's note in his *Zeitschrift* I (1835) p. 420.

³⁶ Comp. in detail my study *Tarbiz* I (4) p. 106 ff.

וכל שכן and later בגזרת החכמה לא נדע ממנו אפי' דבר קטן — שאנחנו כבר זכרנו אופני החכמה שגורה חכמתו... *MN* III, 25 p. 39a: ... כל אלו הפעולות... and later, p. 39b: ... נמשך אחר חכמתו ית' ואנחנו נסכל הרבה מאפני החכמה.

The interpretation of וגר זאב עם כבש on which *Treat. (Kob. 10⁴)* reads: אנחנו כבר בארנו זה בפירוש בס' מורה הנבוכים: *MN* III, 11 p. 14 (where the biblical verse is explained as referring to men).

Treat. Kob. 8³: ומפני זה נאמין אנחנו שהמלאכים אינם גופות ושבני העולם הבא נפשות נבדלות רוצה לומר דעות, וכבר בארנו ראיות מן התורה על זה במאמרנו המכונה מורה נבוכים. Of the two statements quoted here from the *Moreh*, the first that the angels are not bodies is to be found in I, 37 p. 59; ch. 49 p. 67b f., II, 2 ff; but the second: ושבני העולם הבא נפשות נבדלות ר"ל דעות שזה השלמות האחרון... ואמנם הוא דעות לבד is taken only from part III ch. 27 p. 41: והוא סבת החיים המתמידים לא זולתו. Similarly, p. 41b on the nature of העמידה המתמדת. Compare also ch. 51 p. 68 on מיתת נשיקה and ch. 54 p. 70b on דעות אמתיות as the final purpose and their meaning for the קיימות הנצחי.

Treat. Kob. 11¹: והיו בני אדם כלם בזמן ההוא מכת הצאב"ה אומרים בקדמות העולם שהם היו מאמינין שהשם רוח הגלגל כמו שבארנו במורה הנבוכים, המכזיבים הגיע הנבואה מאת שידמה שהשם רוח הגלגל... ולזה האמינו הצאב"ה כולם קדמות העולם שהשמים אצלם הם האלה, which is continued, especially on p. 43a, dealing with the ideas of the Sabeans on prophecy and magic. Similarly, *MN* III, 45 p. 56: וכאשר סכלו אנשי הצאב"ה מציאות השם: יתע' וחשבו שהנמצא הקדמון... הוא הגלגל וכוכביו ושפעות ממנו על הצלמים וקצת האילנות... חשבו שהצלמים והאילנות הם אשר ישימו דברי הנבואה בפי הנביאים וידברו עמם בחזון וכ'.

Treat. Kob. 11² about the necessary device—the התחבולה הזאת—of a roundabout way for educational purposes in interpretation of Ex. 13.17 ולא נחם אלהים דרך ארץ פלשתים כי קרוב הוא *MN* III, 42 p. 45b, based on the same biblical verse and using repeatedly the term תחבולה; similarly *MN* III, 24 p. 37.

Treat. Kob. ibid. on the usefulness of exercise: תקון העיניים וכבר בארנו שזה בדין עם העבודה והפסד עם המרי

is based on *MN* III, 32 p. 46b; similarly *MN* III, 36 p. 49 והוא שהשם יתעלה משיג עניינו ובידו לתקנם אם נעברהו ולהפסידם אם נמרהו.

Treat. Kōb. 11³ (continuation of the preceding): ואמר אם תלכו עמי בקרי . . . כלומר שתשימו מה שיחול בכם מאלו המכות מקרה לא שהם עונש, אמר שהוא ית' יתמיד בחרון אפו . . . אמר והלכתם עמי בקרי which is almost a literal quotation from *MN* III, 36 p. 49: ר"ל שאני כשאביא לכם אלו הצרות לענוש אתכם אם תחשבו בהם שהם מקרה אוסיף לכם מן המקרה ההוא . . . והוא ענין אמרו והלכתם עמי בקרי.

These references, then, among which there is one to the very last chapter of the third part of the *Moreh Nebukim* settle it beyond any doubt that the *Treatise on Resurrection*, i. e. 1190, has to be regarded as a *terminus ad quem* for the completion of the *Moreh Nebukim*.³⁷ The question which still remains to be solved is whether or not the *Treatise* is at the same time the *terminus a quo*. We come, thus, to the theory of Graetz.

Graetz, too, as stated above, bases his dating upon a letter. It is the letter to Ibn Aknin, a fragment of which is published by Munk.³⁸ In this letter which, as it stands, obviously precedes the *Treatise on Resurrection* of 1190 — because Maimonides announces his intention to write it — and which is therefore dated by Munk 1189, Maimonides writes to his disciple that he is sending him six installments of the *Moreh* which conclude the first part. Hence, deduces Graetz, at that time, i. e. 1189, not more than the first part was completed; but since in the *Treatise* of 1190 the *Moreh* appears to be complete,³⁹ the completion of

³⁷ The note which Marx, "Texts etc." p. 386, found to the effect that Maim. "finished" the *Moreh* in 1512 Sel.=1200, may still be correct with regard to some later revisions, perhaps in connection with the annotated copy sent by Samuel Ibn Tibbon, as Marx surmises. But it certainly can have no bearings on the date of the actual completion of the book.

³⁸ *Notice*, see above n. 8.

³⁹ Graetz's reasoning in this matter comes very close to a vicious circle. On p. 309 n. 3 he reasons from the letter to Ibn Aknin, the date of which he quotes as 1189, that at that time the *Moreh* had not been completed. Yet previously, p. 303 n. 1, he writes, on the letter to Ibn Aknin: "Dieses Schreiben trägt zwar das Datum Marcheschwan 1503 Sel.=Oktober 1191; allein es ist korrumpiert, wie schon Munk angegeben. Man kann es spätestens 1501=1189 ansetzen, da damals der *Moreh* noch nicht vollendet war, und erst

the book must have taken place between these two dates, not after 1190 yet also not before 1189.

According to this theory we have to assume that in the period from 1180 (completion of *Mišneh-Torah*) to 1189 Maimonides wrote only the first part of the *Moreh*, while in the short time between 1189–1190 he completed part two and three and wrote in addition the *Treatise on Resurrection* in which he already refers to the *Moreh* as to a book the knowledge of which may be expected from the reader of the *Treatise*. This in addition to the assumption mentioned before, that the *Moreh* was published in installments immediately after they had been written. These two improbabilities should suffice to make us look more closely at that fragment of the letter on which this theory is based.

This letter to Ibn Aknin is extant in two versions. One in the original Arabic in MS and partly published,⁴⁰ and the other

in dem Traktat de resurrectione, verf. 1502 = 1190 als vollendet zitiert wird." The date, then, of the letter is here corrected — and put earlier — because of the fact that the *Moreh* had not been completed, while this very fact about the *Moreh* is proven on p. 309 from the corrected date of the letter. Munk, who is quoted here, is free from this logical blunder, since his correction of the date of the letter has nothing to do with the *Moreh* but is based solely on the relation to the date of the *Treatise on Resurrection*, whose date is certain, and which is mentioned in our letter as something Maim. is about to write but has not written yet. — Graetz's statement that in the *Treatise* the *Moreh* is "als vollendet zitiert" is also not correct; all that we know in this respect is based only on internal evidence from the quoted passages of the *Moreh*, but nowhere in the *Treatise* does Maim. make any statement about his having completed the *Moreh*.

⁴⁰ There are the Tama-MS in Paris (s. Munk, *Notice* p. 9 n. 1, p. 21 n. 3), the MS Simonsen, now in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, and a full MS, probably a copy of the latter, in the Library of the Hebrew Union College. Published so far are: 1) the last part by Munk in *Notice* (s. n. 8), 2) the middle part with annotations by Goldziher by Poznanski in his *Babylonische Geonim im nachgaonäischen Zeitalter* (*Schriften der Lehranstalt f. d. Wiss. d. Juden*. IV, 1, 2) p. 56 f. — The first part of the letter is still unpublished in the original. The entire letter is published in a, not very reliable, Hebrew translation (from the Paris MS) in Goldberg's *Birkat Abraham*. A German translation of the entire letter has been published by H. Wolff in *MGWJ* vol. LXXIX (1935) p. 81. This translation is based in the middle and last parts upon the versions of Poznanski and Munk, while the first part is translated from the extant Hebrew translations.

which is to be found in Hebrew only in our printed editions.⁴¹ Neither of these two versions has a beginning, namely the usual formal addressing of the recipient and the introductory phrases; both have entirely different endings. The version in the editions does not contain that passage on the sending of the six installments of the *Moreh*.

There is also another short letter, extant only in Hebrew and published by Munk⁴² and in Lichtenberg's *Ḳobez*,⁴³ beginning בננו העזו ותלמידו היקר, which Geiger⁴⁴ and Steinschneider⁴⁵ regard also as belonging to, or being a different version of a part of our long letter. Steinschneider⁴⁶ once tried to reestablish the unity of the original letter by putting together the three fragments then extant and regarding them as follows: 1) the short letter בננו העזו וכ' as the beginning; 2) the letter printed in the editions — אמר ממה שתדערו — as the middle part; 3) the fragment published by Munk — corresponding to the Hebrew וכבר הניעתני אגרה — as the complete version of the last part of the letter. This arrangement could not be meant literally even then, when only these three pieces were known, since they certainly do not appear as clear-cut parts of an original unit which have only to be put in their proper order and thus reunited. A part of the short letter בננו העזו would be duplicated in the middle piece, viz. in the letter of the editions (in fact this duplication is the only reason for our assuming that this short letter belongs here at all). And also the middle piece, that of our editions, does not stop at the point where the Munk fragment, the supposed part 3, begins; for apart from the two passages (1, ואמנם מעייני בעניני העולם and 2, וכבר הודעתך שנפטרה

⁴¹ Tama, *Pe'er Hador* no. 142; Ed. Amsterdam p. 14b; *Ḳobez* II p. 30.

⁴² *Notice* p. 67; also in Goldberg *Birkat Abraham* 'סמן' p. X.

⁴³ *Ḳobez* II p. 29.

⁴⁴ *Liter. Blatt des Israeliten* 1846 p. 136: Der zweite Brief auf S. 67 (sc. of Munk's *Notice*) ist übrigens offenbar bloss eine andere, aber treue Übersetzung von dem Anfange jenes grösseren Briefes an Josef, von dem bei uns in den Briefsammlungen . . . ein kürzerer Auszug gegeben worden, und der im Arab. Originale des Codex . . . noch viel kürzer ist.

⁴⁵ *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1901.

⁴⁶ In Ersch und Grubers *Realencycl.* II vol. 31 p. 47. Comp. also *Cat. Bodl. loc. cit.*

הבטח הקטנה) which are chronologically impossible, there are passages overlapping with the Munk fragment and again others which are not contained in the Munk fragment and yet there is no reason for their elimination.

The situation becomes still more complicated and an attempt simply to reassemble the pieces still more difficult when we examine the letter in its entirety, in the now known full Arabic version (or Goldberg's translation of it) as compared with the letter in our editions. We find now that also the "middle" part differs in the two versions, in many points, and even where the versions deal with the same main topic each version contains interspersed additional passages which are not found in the other; the variants, therefore, cannot be regarded as pieces complementing one another and forming the original unit if put together. These differences, and also differences in arrangement even when materially the same thing is expressed, are apt to support an attempt to *dissolve* the given units of the versions into original parts rather than to combine them into a supposed original unit.

For a better understanding a detailed collation of the two versions seems to be necessary. I give here the collation of the two Hebrew versions, in the *Ḳobez*⁴⁷ and in *Birkat Abraham*,⁴⁸ and for the purpose of checking up I add also in the third column the corresponding Arabic original.⁴⁹ I quote in full only those passages in which the two versions differ while those in which they agree, and also the Arabic original, I indicate only by the initial and final words of each passage.

⁴⁷ Method of quoting: e. g. 31⁴=p. 31, col. 4. — The pages of *Birkat Abraham* containing the letter have no numbers, they will be quoted, therefore, by Roman numbers which we apply, beginning the counting from the first page of the text.

⁴⁸ Where it is most necessary I try to give a more exact Hebrew version than that of Goldberg. There is also a new Hebrew edition of the correspondence of Maimonides in preparation by friends in Palestine.

⁴⁹ I quote the beginning of the letter from the MS HUC; the middle from Poznanski(P), the end from Munk(M); see n. 40.

Arabic text

*Birkat Abraham**Ḳobez*

ואני יודעת כלית המסכנים
האלו וכי אינה אלא
התשובה. וראוי לאדם
שיתנהג בכתבו בדרכי
המוסר ולא ראוי לאדם
שיפגע בבני דורו בדבורו
וכל שכן בכתבו. והם
יתפארו בו ולא ידעו
האנשים מה כתבו הם ועל
כן אחרתי את תשובתי
אליהם תכלית האחור.
ואמנם הסבה המכרחת
שיכתוב אלי תחלה הוא
מפני שאיש כמוני יבדוק
כל מעשיו הקטנים וכל
דבוריו.^{49a}

VII₈₆–VIII₇

5. „פלמא שנעוא עלי” –
„מן אנל אשארתיך”
P, p. 58 f.

5. „ואת אשר התלוננו
עלי” עד למען אתן
לך עצות”^{49a}

VIII₇₋₁₇

5. חסר

6. „ואלדי ארידה מן
חצרה” – „לא יעטם הדא
עליך”
P, p. 59

6. „ואת אשר אבקש
מכבודך הבן” עד „אל
ירע זה בעיניך”

VIII₁₇₋₂₁

6. „ומה שארצה מכבוד
הבן” עד „חלילה לך
שיקשה עליך זה”
31² ll. 18–25

7. „מן הו אלדי יצרב” –
„אן יחבך וישכרך”
P, p. 59

7. „כי מי הוא זה אשר
יכוהו ולא יצעק וכי דא
ידעת כי עשית לו נזק רב
וחסרת תהלתו וקפחת
חשיבותו. ולולא אתה היה
ראש הגלות לפניו כאפרוח

7. חסר

^{49a} Will be printed in full later.

Arabic text	<i>Birkat Abraham</i>	<i>Ḳobeẓ</i>
	בצפרניו החדים ואם בענין הגש וכיוצא בו הוא מעליל ומתנפל עליך, הנה איך תבקש ממי שהזקתו שיאהבך ויכבדך".	
	VIII ₂₁₋₂₄	
8. "ולא חנה לך" – "אן חשתם ולא תשתם" P, p. 59 f.	8. "ואין טענה לך עליהם" ע ד "מן הנעלבים ואינם עולבים" VIII ₂₄₋₃₀	8. "ואין צורך לך באמרך" ע ד "ותהיה מן העלובים ולא מן העולבים" 31 ² II. 26–42
9. "ולא תסלם אלפֿטך" – "ואלדין אכרא" P, p. 60 l. 6 f.	9. חסר	9. "ואל תשליך דבריך והשתכל לשם יתברך תחלה, ואתה חכם בעל דעת ובעל דין ורת וקרוב לשלימות" 31 ² II. 40–42
10. "ואנעל גאיתך מע הדא אלרגל" – לא תכרג ען ראי בוגה" 49b P, p. 60 II. 7–9	10. חסר	10. חסר
11. "ואמא מא שאלבת מני" – "בעד אלבחת ואלתקצי ענה" P, p. 60	11. "ואשר בקשת ממני לכתוב אל הראש גלות כבר כתבתי והגיענו כתבו וקראתיו במשכני ואנכי הייתי עומד והיו במשכני כל אנשי מצרים מקטן ועד גדול אשר היה לו מעלה והיה זה בסכות וכולם עמדו לעמדי והיה	11. חסר

^{49b} This is an obscure passage. See Wolff's attempt *MGWJ* (1935), p. 86.

Arabic text

*Birkat Abraham**Ḳobez*

היום יום נכבד וקורא
האגרת היה ר' שמואל
המלמד וכל זקני הקהלה
יושבים על ספסל אבן
על ימינו ועל שמאלו. ומה
תבקש ממני יותר ואני
כתבתי לראש הישיבה כי
לו ידעתי כי שם מחלוקת
לא הייתי מכנים עצמי
בוה אך כבר עשיתי אשר
עשיתי וכבר נשמע קרן
ביבנה. וביארתי לו
והודעתיו כי לא יתכן לו
לחזור. ואתה בני הנכבד
תודיע לראש הישיבה את
אשר עשיתי ותודיע לראש
הישיבה כי אני לא אכתוב
לו עד אשר יגיעני כתב
הבן בגלוי הענינים
ואודיענו אחרי הבקור
ומשפט על הדבר"

VIII₃₁-IX₂

12. "ואמא חדתאלמקאלה"
 — "העולם הבא בימות
 המשיח"

P, p.60—M, p.22

12. "ואמנם כדבר החבור"
 עד "העולם הבא בימות
 המשיח"

IX₂₋₈

12. "ואמנם מענין המאמר
 עד "נשתבש עדיהם
 העולם הבא בימות
 המשיח"

31² l. 42—³¹ l. 16

13. "ומע כוננא ב'נא"
 "תצלך קריב בכטי"
 M, p. 22 f.

13. "ואף כי בארנו בפרק
 חלק מה שביארנו ובארנו
 באלה המקומות ומנינו שם
 במספר שאין להם חלק
 לעולם הבא ומכללם
 הכופר בתחית המתים.
 ואיך יחשוב אחד משלימי

13.
 חסר

Arabic text

Birkat Abraham

Köbez

השכל כי זה היסוד לא
 יאמינו כל המאמין בדת
 ישראל עם פרסומו
 וברורו. ואני תמה על
 השואלים ועל המשיב וכן
 אני תמה עליך אשר
 אמרת כי אין ראוי לפרש
 המקראות אשר באו בענין
 תחית המתים. ומי הוא
 אשר באר אותם ומי
 הוא אשר דבר בענינים
 האלה. ובכלל אומר לך
 כי אחבר קונטרס בענין
 זה יגיע לך במהרה בכתב
 ידי."

IX⁹⁻¹⁴

14. וקד וגהת לך מן
 אלדלאלה — —, ורשעי
 ישראל כתירון"
 M, p. 23

14. "וכבר הגיעו לידך
 מספר המורה ששה
 קונטרסים אשר קבלתם
 מאיש אחר והמה תשלום
 החלק הראשון ומפני
 שהיה לי ספק באה
 לידך גם ההקדמה אני
 שולחה לך עתה ולא
 נתת להעתיקה אך להדיין
 החסיד אבו אל מחאסן
 וגם אתה תזהר בה ולא
 תפרסמה למען לא יזיקוני
 הגוים ורשעי ישראל אשר
 הם רבים."

IX¹⁴⁻¹⁷

15. "ואמא מא דכרתה"
 עלי חפט אל חבור"
 M, p. 23

15. "ואמנם מה שזכרת"
 ע ד. עם שמירת החבור"
 IX¹⁷⁻¹⁸

15. "ואמנם מה שזכרת"
 ע ד. על עיון החבור"
 31³ ll. 17-19

14.
 חסר

Arabic text

*Birkat Abraham**Kobez*

16. "לכן אכאף אן תטרא
עליך" – בתלמוד תורה
חקיקה"
M, p. 23

16. "אך יראתי כי תמשוך
עליך דעות עמהם תמיד
ולא תבא לתכלית כי אם
אם מתוך רעות. וכן
אחרי אשר תעמיס עליך
חובה ללמד תמעט
במסחר ואני לא איעצך
שתקח מהם דבר כי טוב
בעיני דרהם אחד שתרויח
מאריגה או מחייטות או
נגרות משתקבל רשות
מאת ראש הגולה, ואם
יהיה לך עסק עמהם
תשפל ואם תקח מהם
דבר תתבוה. ועצתי
שתעסוק במשא ומתן
ותלמוד חכמת הרפואה
ותעסוק בתלמוד תורה
על דרך האמת."

IX¹⁹⁻²³

16.
חסר

17. "ולא תדרס אלא
הלכות אלרב ז"ל" –
לאחסאן אלטריק"
M, p. 23-24

17. "ולא תלמוד אלא
הלכות הרב" עד "בדרך
היותר טוב"

IX²³⁻²⁷

17. "ולא תתעסק כ"א
בהלכות הרב" ע ד
ויישירך בטוב הדברים"
31³ II. 19-26

18.
חסר

18.
חסר

18. "ואמנם מעייני בענייני
העולם אין לי נחמה זולתי
בשני דברים כשאסתכל
ואעיין במה שאעיין. ושזה
בני אברהם השם יתב'
נתן לו חן וברכה מברכת
מי שנקרא על שמו, ומי
שהאמין בשמו והאמין
בנתינתו הוא יאמיץ
ויתמיד ויאריך חייו

Arabic text

Birkat Abraham

Kobez

ושנותיו, כי הוא עניו ושפל
שבאנשים מצורף אל זה
טוב מדותיו והוא בעל
שכל דק וטבע נאה ויהיה
לו בע"ה שם בגדולים
בלא ספק. אשאל מהשם
יתברך שישגיח עדיו
וישלים עליו חסדיו."

31³ l. 26—4 l. 5

.19

חסר

.19

חסר

19. וכבר הודעתך
שנפטרה הבת הקטנה
הש"י ישיב מיתתה כפרה.
בני לא תתאבל ולא
תתעצב לא על זכר ולא
על נקבה. השם יתברך
יודע ועד והאמת מה
שאומר, והוא שטוב ענייני
מין האדם אצל כד
משכיל. ולא אומר שהוא
ענין טוב מוחלט, אלא
שהוא היותר נאות ומעט
הדאגה. שאין תחבולה
בזה המציאות המתוקן
תיקון גדול טוב מאד כפי
מה שמרה חכמת בוראו
שיעיין האדם ויסתכל
בטוב בעניני מציאות
המינין, לא שיעיין ויסתכל
בטוב ענייני אישי הפרט.
ושמא כשיגיעו אליך פרקי
מורה הנבוכים בזה הענין
יתבאר לך זה הכלל
ביאור מספיק בע"ה ית'."

31⁴ ll. 5—15

Arabic text	<i>Birkat Abraham</i>	<i>Kōbez</i>
<p>20. „ואעלמך אן קד חצלת לי” – „למטאלעה גמלה כתבה” M, p. 24 f.</p>	<p>20. „ואודיעך כי נתפרסם שמי מאוד ברפואה בין הגדולים כמו השופט הגדול והמנהיגים ובחצר אל פאצל וולתם משרי המדינה ואין לי מהם ריוח מאומה. והמון העם לא ימצאו דרך לבא אלי כי אני רם ונשא עליהם. ועל כן כל ימי יחלופו בבקור חולים בקיירא וכאשר אשוב למצרים אני חלוש ובזמן הנשאר לי מן היום ומן הלילות לא אוכל לקרות בספרי הרפואות כפי הצריך. כי אתה ידעת אורך המלאכה הזאת וקושיה אצל כל מי שיש בלבו יראת השם ואוהב אמת ולא ירצה לאמר דבר אם לא יביא ראיה ואנה נאמרו הדברים וההקשים עליהם. וזאת היא הסבה אשר לא אוכל למצוא שעה לעיין בדבר מדברי תורה ולא אקרא כי אם ביום השבת בלבד, אבל שארהחכמות לא אוכל למצוא שעה כלל לעיין בהם והניע לי היוק רב מאוד מזה השער. ובאלו הימים באו אלי כל ספרי אבן רשד אשר חברם על ספרי אריסטו מלבד החוש והמוחש וראיתי כי הוא</p>	<p>20. חסר</p>

Arabic text

Birkat Abraham

Kobez

הלך בדרך הישר והטוב
בכל אשר יישר אך לא
מצאתי שעה פנויה לעיין
בכל ספריו."

IX₂₇₋₃₈

.21

חסר

.21

חסר

21. וכבוד הבן יודע כי
אלו הגדולות והשררות
של יהודים עתה בזה הזמן
אינם אצלי הצלחה ולא
טובה שלימה מכוונת ולא
רעה מעוטה, חי השם
יתברך, אלא תכלית
הטורח והעמל והיגיעה.
כי האיש השלם המצליח
בתכלית ההצלחה שיעיין
בהצלחת הדת ועשיית
המחוייב עליו לעשותו
ויתרחק מדעת בני אדם
כולם ומהדרכים הפחותים
והמדות המנונות. כי
המשחרר ירבו יגונותיו
ועצבונותיו ושמאיכלימוהו
ויביישוהו הגוים ויפול ביד
המלוכה וייסרו אותו
וישברו עצמותיו. ואם יביט
בענייני האדם ושישיר
דרכיו לפני ה' כבר עמד
כנגד תורת השם ית'
ועשה חניפות ומשוא פנים.
ואזהרת התורה בכבוד
הממאנים והממרים מבואר
מאד כאשר אמר בכמו
זה הענין נביא השם איש
האלהים לעלי הכהן
ותכבד את בניך ממני."

31⁴ II. 15-29

Arabic text	<i>Birkat Abraham</i>	<i>Kobez</i>
22. ולא תקטע עני כתאבהא" – אתק"ג לשטרות" M, p. 25	22. ואל תמנע ממני מכתביך כי המה לבדם תנחומותי. וכאשר יבא אבן אל משאט מהודו תחשוב עמו החשבונות כאשר זכרת לך. כל אוהבינו שואלים בשלומך ובשלום כולכם, והזקן אבו אל מעאלי ואחיו ובנינו אבו אל רצה וכל בני בתי החורים והעבדים יודע אלהים כי כודם שמחים לשמוע בשורות טובות ממך ומתפללים על הצלחתך והצלחותינו. ותניע שלומי הרב להזקן הנעלה הדין העניו הישר והנאמן כג"ק רבי יאשיה התלמיד הותיק תפארת כהנים ועוז שצ"ו וכן תתן שלומים רבים לבנו וירבה אלהים שמחתו בו ויראה זרע ויאריך ימים. ואף כי אסרו חכמינו ואמרו אין שואלים בשלום אשה כלל אמנם להתפלל בשלומה מותר, אתה שלום וביתך שלום וכעת חיה ולשרה בן. ושלומכם ירבה ויגדל כחפצכם וכחפץ הכותב משה בר' מימון ז"ל ר"ח מרחשון אתק"ג לשטרות".	22. חסר

As a result of the collation of the two versions we find first that of the twenty-two passages of both versions combined the printed version lacks ten passages (4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22) which are contained in the Arabic MS or in Goldberg's translation (except for passage 10 which is missing also in *Birkat Abraham*). These passages are, of course, not of equal length or importance, yet the distribution and interspersion of the lacunae over the entire letter show that the letter in the printed editions can not be regarded simply as a part, complete in itself, of the larger letter in the MS but must be considered a different version of that letter in its entirety. And it should be remarked that the printed version, which is translated by Samuel Ibn Tibbon,⁵⁰ deserves as such not less consideration than the copy of the Arabic MS which has reached us. On the other hand there are 3 passages of the printed editions (18, 19, 20) missing in the MS;⁵¹ (and 4 in *Birkat Abraham* — adding to the former 3 also the phrase in passage 9 which Goldberg either omitted or did not have in his MS). The question is now: is this disagreement in the two versions inexplicable or can we find a clue to an explanation?

Two of the 3 passages missing in the MS and contained in the editions are easily explained. The earlier editions indicate clearly that beginning with passage 19 — וכבר הודעתך שנפטרה — הבת הקטנה — fragments from other letters were added.⁵² We need, therefore, not dwell upon their internal compatibility with the rest of the letter.

⁵⁰ Ed. Amst. p. 14b has the note: וזאת האגרת כתבה הר"ם במז"ל בלשון קדר והעתיקה החכם ר' שמואל אבן חבון וצ"ל.

⁵¹ Also the introductory sentence in the editions אמר ממה שהדעתה שאיני אומר has no equivalent in the MS.

⁵² Ed. Amst. p. 17a has the note: ועוד זה לו וצ"ל בכתב ארוך בעניינים רבים ראינו שאעתיק מדבריו הנחמדים קצת הגדה לתלמידו ז"ל this remark (cf. Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1901), so does also the *Kobez*. The Berlin edition, *Kitbe Kodeš le-Harambam* of 1764 (no pagination), which has for the entire letter the curious heading להגות משה ב"ם להגות פתשן הכתב מרבינו משה ב"ם להגות (a mistake similar to Carmoly's, see the following note), has also a new heading for the part of the letter beginning with הנפתרה הבת הקטנה — אמר; the heading הג"ל ליד כתב מאה הג"ל makes it appear as a separate letter.

But also in the other parts we find that some of the passages are chronologically impossible. First that passage of the printed editions (18) ואמנם מעייני העולם in which Maimonides describes his young son and his good qualities intellectual and moral. Since Abraham was born in 1186 this description which would be appropriate only for a boy of about 14 could certainly not have been made before the *Treatise on Resurrection* (1190) nor at the time of the date in the MS nor could it conform chronologically with other facts contained in the letter.⁵³

⁵³ Comp. Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.* 1902 (D); Also Eppenstein *Moses ben Maimon* p. 77 n. 2 (where the quoted passage beginning with ואמנם in *Kob.* p. 31 is, of course, our passage מעייני ואמנם and not the preceding passage (ואמנם מה שזכרת מהליכתך לבבל). This incompatibility of dates with regard to Abraham had also been used in the opposite direction, namely to date the *Treatise on Resurrection* about 1512 Sel. = 1201. Geiger, in his *Zeitschrift II* (1836) p. 563, referring to remarks by Rappaport on Abraham, writes: "Abraham nämlich wird in diesem Briefe des M. . . der aber vor der Abfassung des eigentlichen Sendschreibens [sc. on Resurrection] geschrieben zu sein scheint, vom zärtlichen Vater als ein verständiger junger Mann geschildert der für die Ehre Seines Vaters eifre. Nun aber ist derselbe im Jahr 1496 d.s.A. geboren und demnach im Jahre 1502 der s. A. erst 6 Jahre alt gewesen." This argument cannot be considered as being based solely on our passage ואמנם מעייני, as Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1915, assumes, and be refuted by eliminating this passage as foreign. In our passage there is only the laudatory description of Abraham but there is nothing of that zealous fight of Abraham for the honor of his father, which Geiger mentions in this connection. This fight appears only in the rest of the letter, whose being a part of our main letter nobody questions. Shall we then assume that Geiger mistook all the phrases in connection with the controversy — e. g. והבן השם יהייהו לא יוכל כל זה Ed. Amst. p. 15a, כיצד יתמה הבן p. 15b, וכבוד הבן יודע, 16a, ומה שארצה, 16b — as referring to his son Abraham? It is hard to find another plausible explanation for Geiger's "der für die Ehre seines Vaters eifre" and this mistake comes very close to that of Carmoly, in *Jost Israel. Annalen* 1840 p. 248 (cf. *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1502) with the only difference that Carmoly takes the entire letter, except the end with our passage מעייני ואמנם, as "addressed to his son," while Geiger takes it only as referring to his son; but the misunderstanding is essentially the same. Hence for the refutation of the late date of the *Treatise* it is not sufficient to eliminate our passage (on the basis of the MS as published by Munk, while Geiger apparently had only the printed versions before him, since to him the *Treatise* does not "seem" — *scheint* — to have been written at the time of this letter, which fact appears clear and definite from the passage on the *Treatise* in the MS). On the other hand all the passages on the zealous fight by the "son" are

Two other chronological inconsistencies are contained in the Arabic version:

1) The passage (13) in which Maimonides announces his writing of the *Treatise on Resurrection* in the near future; this disagrees with the date at the end 1503 Sel.=1191. Munk⁵⁴ settles this contradiction by simply declaring the date at the end as an error of the copyist, yet we have to consider things first as they stand.

2) The passage (5) of the MS dealing with Maimonides' explanation as to why he recognized a man who, the opponents say, is ignorant and not worthy. Since this passage and the questions as to whom it may refer to has become a controversial matter I shall reprint it here in the Arabic original with the corrections suggested by Goldziher⁵⁵ and also in a new Hebrew translation, since Goldberg's translation here is faulty throughout.

<p>ואשר התלוננו עלי כיצר נשאתי פנים לאיש אשר לא ידעתי מיבו ומה מעשהו ומלאכתו ואשר אומרים עליו שכל ת"ח מתרחק ממנו ושואף הריש גלותא מתעבו. והנה יכול אני להוכיח במופתים ולברר לך שאני נשאתי פנים לו עפ"י עדות תלמידי שאני סומך עליו שהוא ירא</p>	<p>פלמא שנעוא עלי' כ"ף קדמת מן לא אדרי לה חאל ומה הו פאעל צאנעא ודכר אן כל ת"ח מנעול ען הדא ואן ראס אלגלות כארהא לה⁵⁶. אחתגנת חנתי וב"נת אני קדמתה בשאהרה תלמידי אלדי וחקת בדינה ומערפתה ותאקה ושאהרה שי מן אהל בלדה והו אבו</p>
--	---

contained also in the MS, and certainly cannot be eliminated. Geiger's note, therefore, based apparently on a misunderstanding, can in no way be used as support here. Yet for our purpose even the praise itself in the passage is sufficient to convince us that it could not have been written at the corrected date, 1190, when Abraham was only 4 years old.

⁵⁴ Notice p. 21 f.

⁵⁵ Quoted from Poznanski (s. n. 40) p. 58.

⁵⁶ This is Goldziher's proposed emendation of the phrase in the MS which would mean that every ת"ח despises this man, while according to the emended reading, the meaning is that the ת"ח also despises this man. Comp. also Poznanski p. 32 n. 3. Goldberg, *Birk. Abr.* VIII, confuses the issue still more and makes of the one person two, of which the first is Ibn Gabbar, the second the Reš Galuta (זה מראש גלות זה). Yet his mistake seems to lie not in the first half, as Poznanski thinks, but in the second.

אלרצא אבן טיבון לאני סאלתה ען דינה וטראיקה יחמדה גרא ובעד דלך קדמתה. ואמא אלכתאב אלדי כתבתה פלם אצמרה אלא הדא אלגרין ואלאשארה אליה בדפע אלמחלוקת וכונה יכון לה אב. פאן מא מנולתך מנולתה ולא מנולתה מנולתך. ותחרות מן כל מא אשאר בה אלולד לאנך תעלם תואצעי מן כל אחד ותסויתי נפסי מע אצור מן יכון לכני כרגת ען אכלאקי פי דלך אלכתאב מן אנל אשארך.

שמים וחכם ונאמן ועל פי עדות אחר מבני עירו והוא אבו אלרצא אבן טיבון אשר שאלתיו על יראתו ודרכיו ויהללו מאד ורק אחר כך נשאתי לו פנים. ואמנם הכתב שכתבתי אליו לא נתכותי בו אלא לתכלית זו ורק לשם עצה שיניח מן המחלוקת וכדי להיות לו לאב. ואולם אין מעלתך מעלתו ואין מעלתו מעלתך. ונשמרתי מפני כל אשר יעצת, בני, כי יודע אתה את עניויותי בפני כל אדם וכיצד אני משובה עצמי אפילו עם הקטן שבקטנים. אבל יוצא אני מגדרי במכתבי זה, כרי להדריכך בעצתי.

This passage cannot refer to another oppositional Reš Galuta whom Maimonides supported against the established one, as was conjectured by some scholars on the basis of the original uncorrected reading in the MS.⁵⁷ The entire context speaks against such an assumption. The references which Maimonides quotes as having received from a pupil and another reliable man are certainly not of such a nature as to justify the support of this man as Reš Galuta, nor can the later remark about Maimonides' humility — that he puts himself on a level even with the most insignificant person — be considered as referring to a Reš Galuta. Also the purpose which Maimonides cites for his action, namely to advise that person to desist from controversy, would be without sense if this very person were an oppositional Reš Galuta, recognized by Maimonides against another one and so being himself the very cause and center of the controversy. In addition there is that detailed description (passage 11) of how reverently and solemnly Maimonides read to his congregation a letter received from the Reš Galuta.⁵⁸ This Reš Galuta

⁵⁷ So Poznanski, *Babyl. Geon.* p. 32, although with some hesitation, and, in n. 3, leaving open the other possibility in accordance with Goldziher's emendation. (Comp. also Eppenstein, *op. cit.* p. 93, with some confusion in details). More definite about this theory is Elbogen, "Moses ben Maimons Persönlichkeit," *MGWJ.* 1935 p. 78. Yet none of the new material, published in recent years, makes this point more certain.

⁵⁸ Comp. Mann, *Texts and Studies* I, p. 241.

can certainly not have been that קטן שבקטנים about whose recognition Maimonides apologizes and explains so much, nor could it very well have been the other Reš Galuta against whom Maimonides fought and whom he even tried to remove. That our passage refers to any oppositional Reš Galuta seems, therefore, to be out of the question.

The entire tenor of the passage rather indicates that the man in question was some insignificant and ignorant person — as piety and good conduct are mentioned as his virtues but not any scholarly qualities — whom Maimonides “recognized” to a degree much less than that which would recommend him for the position of Reš Galuta. Goldberg’s suggestion,⁵⁹ therefore, that this is an explanation for Maimonides’ letter to Ibn Ġabbar of Baghdad appears highly acceptable. Not only do the before-mentioned details in the characterization of the man fit this case, since Ibn Ġabbar did not know even Hebrew, but also the advice to avoid controversy is fully understandable, because Maimonides in his letter to Ibn Ġabbar actually asks him not to continue any of the controversies.⁶⁰ To be sure the name is not mentioned in our letter, but here we may supplement our information from the short letter בנו העוז, which, on account of other agreements, has been recognized as a part or another variant of a part of our letter.⁶¹ There Ibn Ġabbar is named ex-

⁵⁹ *Birk. Abr.* p. VIII.

⁶⁰ See Letter to ibn Ġabbar in Edelmann, *Hemda Genuzah* p. 3, esp. towards the end p. 6; *Kob.* II p. 16⁴.

⁶¹ See above n. 44, 45. Another possible parallel between the MS of our letter and the short letter may also be the *Geṭ* incident which is alluded to in both letters in a very vague way. In our MS we have an allusion to attacks and libels in connection with a *Geṭ* affair; Poznanski p. 59: ואנה כאן ישנע עליך (Goldberg, *Birk. Abr.* p. VIII, not precise enough היה והיה טורף אותו (מפרסם ענין הגט והיה טורף אותו). The suggestion by Mann, *op. cit.* p. 242 n. 91, “for אלגט r. אלכט, the signature” is of little help, since the case of a signature is not less “obscure” here than that of the *Geṭ*; besides, חַט means handwriting, not signature. In the short letter, Munk *Notice* p. 68 (*Kob.* 29⁴), we read, among other controversies mentioned, the phrase: וכן ביני ובין דיין סולמסה: which phrase Freimann, *Tešubot Harambam* p. XXXI quotes: ‘וסף בן מר יוסף וכן’. While in the *Tešubot* the source of this variant is not clearly indicated—Dr. Freimann informs me, that it is the same MS. Vat. Neofiti ebr. 11 fol.

pressly.⁶² But apart from this identification, if we were to assume that the man in our letter is not Ibn Ġabbar, the coincidence in both letters in so many points would be curious indeed: for we would have to assume that in two different cases Maimonides wrote to Ibn Aknin about a reproach against him for having written to or "recognized" an ignorant man in Baghdad and that in each case he gave as his justification the piety of the man and his own humility in such matters. Therefore it may be quite safely accepted that our passage refers to none other than Ibn Ġabbar.⁶³

But if it refers to Ibn Ġabbar the passage is chronologically incompatible with the passage (13) in our letter about the

73v., from which also the variant סולמסי דין is quoted there. This *Geḥ* affair of the short letter may perhaps be the same as that which is mentioned in our MS and this would be an additional point in common in the two letters.

As to the place סולמסה (*Ġob*) = Sajilmāsa in Morocco, it should be remembered that Ibn Aknin as well as Zecharya came from the Maghrib and that there was constant and lively intercommunication between the Maghrib, Baghdad and the other Jewish centers. According to both versions in ed. Freimann סולמסה or סולמסי appears to be the name of the opponent in question.

⁶² The passage, Munk, *Notice* p. 67 (*Ġob*. II p. 293) reads: ואמנם אבן זבאר הפציר בנו בכמה כתבים עם הסוחרים וראיתי אדם יראה ממנו השתדלות וסיעתיו על מה שבקש מהיות כתיבתו בידו. ודע שאני אכוון לעשות כל מה שיש בו ענוותנות ואעפ"י שיויק לנו אצל ההמון מאוד. וכל מי שרוצה להראות שלמותו בחסרוני ואפילו הוא מקטני התלמידים מחלנו לו בזה.

⁶³ An additional point to support this view may be the fact of the association with Maimonides' disciples which is mentioned in the letter to Ibn Ġabbar as well as in our long letter in the MS. In the letter to Ibn Ġabbar, *Ḥemda Genuzah* p. 36: *Ḥobez* II, p. 15¹ (זכר לנו גם כן ששמע מחלמידיי ישמרם צורם: (זכר לנו נ"כ ששמע מחלמידיי חכמים ישמרם צורם.) And in our letter we have the expression (quoted above in the text) עפ"י עדות חלמידיי — עפ"י עדות חלמידיי — as reason for his correspondence with Ibn Ġabbar. — Steinschneider's surmise (*Ersch und Gruber, loc. cit.*) that by the מחלמידיי in the letter to Ibn Ġabbar Ibn Aknin may be meant, is highly improbable even if compared only with the detailed explanation concerning the letter to Ibn Ġabbar in the short letter to Ibn Aknin (s. above n. 62), which would be senseless if Ibn Aknin had known Ibn Ġabbar before the latter wrote to Maimonides. And this improbability is definitely established if we identify the man in our letter with Ibn Ġabbar and see not only a very detailed description of Ibn Ġabbar but also the mentioning of a disciple who recommended Ibn Ġabbar — and this written to Ibn Aknin. This disciple, who can certainly not be Ibn Aknin himself, is probably one of those disciples who are mentioned in the letter to Ibn Ġabbar.

Treatise on Resurrection. For in the latter passage Maimonides announces that he will write the *Treatise* in the near future⁶⁴ while in our passage he refers to the reproach about the letter to Ibn Ġabbar in which letter Maimonides speaks of this treatise as already written.⁶⁵ Steinschneider's attempt⁶⁶ to reconcile these two passages, as chronologically consistent, must be rejected as utterly untenable. And it was for this discrepancy that Graetz⁶⁷ rejected Goldberg's opinion that our passage refers to Ibn Ġabbar. Yet we saw that the reference to Ibn Ġabbar is most probable, therefore the chronological difficulty, as above in the case of the date, must be faced as it stands — and another solution must be looked for.

If we combine now the two observations we made concerning this letter — namely the difference between the two versions in entire passages and the chronological inconsistencies in both versions — we find that precisely these chronologically inconsistent passages of one version are the ones which are missing in the other version. In the printed version we have neither passage (5), on Ibn Ġabbar, nor passage (13), on the *Treatise*, nor even the date at the end; in the MS there is missing passage (18), on the son Abraham (and also passage 19 about the death of the little girl).

The solution, therefore, that appears highly suggestive is that we have before us, in both versions, not one letter but a collection of fragments of letters of different periods — each version omitting carefully some chronologically impossible fragments

⁶⁴ MS HUC p. 195 (Munk Notice p. 23): ובאלומלה סאולף פי דלך מקאלה הי: תצאלך קריבא בכטי (p. 26): En somme, je vais composer, sur ce sujet, un traité que tu recevras prochainement écrit de ma propre main. Comp. *Birk. Abr.* p. IX (passage 13 in our analysis above).

⁶⁵ *Ĥenda Genuzah* p. 4a (*Kob.* II, p. 15²): (scil. תחית המתים). וכבר חברנו בזה הענין (מאמר להבנת זה המעות והוא בלי ספק יגיע לכם וכ'.

⁶⁶ In Ersch und Gruber, *loc. cit.*: "Die Abhandlung über die Auferstehung wird als bereits geschrieben, aber noch nicht abgesendet bezeichnet, so dass über die Gleichzeitigkeit der beiden Briefe kein Zweifel obwalten kann." It is impossible to see how the statement that the *Treatise has been written* (see n. 65) can be reconciled and regarded as simultaneous with the statement (n. 64) that he is *going* to write this *Treatise*.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 308 n. 2.

but incorporating others. This character, of a collection of fragments, is not only clearly indicated in the heading of the printed editions but also in some little remarks of the editor within both versions.⁶⁸

Another feature in the versions which supports the view that we have before us a collection of fragments is the transposition of certain phrases or short passages. The short letter *בנו העזו* begins with the explanation of the Ibn Ġabbar letter and only much later speaks of the difference between the excitement of young Ibn Aknin in this controversy and Maimonides' own calm and willingness to forgive. In the long letter, in the version of the MS, the latter passage is right in the beginning while the Ibn Ġabbar affair is introduced much later (passage 5), after the long description of the four principles containing the entire story of the controversy with his opponents.

Still more characteristic in this connection, it seems to me, are the changes even within the introduction of the long letter in our two versions, which I put down here in full, adding also that part of the introduction which is contained in the short letter *בנו העזו*:

Short letter (Munk 67)	<i>Birkat Abraham</i> (MS)	Editions (<i>Ḳob.</i> 30 ^י)
(2) חה אשר אירע לילד	(2) דע כי אני מוותר	(1) אמר ממה שתרדעו
מכאב לב וחוק הכעס	מאד בחלקי אך בני לא	שאיני מסופק בעניין מן
בשביל הטעאת מי שמטעה	יוכל לסבול.	העניינים שכך חשבתי
או בסבת חולק בשקר,	ואמר עוד	שיהיה ונתאמת אצלי
השנים ⁶⁹ מחיבים לך זה.		שאותם הדברים כך

⁶⁸ Ed. Amst. p. 14b has after the heading *וזאת האגרת* (s. above n. 50) another heading *זה קצת מכתבי הר"ם במ"ל לתלמידו ר' יוסף בר' יהודה ז"ל* which means "some of Maimonides' writings to his disciples." Steinschneider's, *Cat. Bodl.* p. 1901, remark that this קצת "vel partem vel 'unam ex' designare potest" seems, in the second alternative — "unam ex" — not quite acceptable for the usual meaning of קצת. Comp. also n. 52, and the following note.

⁶⁹ The correction of *השנים* for the misread *השנים* by Munk is given by Geiger, *loc. cit.*, who also identifies the expression with the phrase *לפי רחיח* in the printed version.

Short letter (Munk 67)	<i>Birkat Acraham</i> (MS)	Editions (<i>Kob.</i> 30 ³)
(1) וכבר הייתי בשנותיך וביותר משנותיך ⁷⁰ ביותר חזק ממה שאתה בו והייתי כמו אשר שמעת אמלא רצוני בלשוני וקולמוסי מגדולים וחכמים כשמבקשים לחלוק עלי.	(1) אנכי הרגלתי השנים והמקרים מצורף לזה אשר ישפוט בו העיון.	אירעו בלא ספק, אבל מדותי עתה אינם כמדות הבן הנחמד השם יחייהו זה כי אני היום שבח לאל יתעלה כבר הכניעוני השנים והמקרים, מצורף אל זה מה שיחייבהו העיון השכלי והחכמות האמתיות.
		(2) ועוד כי אני מוחל על כבודי ומוותר על עלבוני הרבה, והבן השם יחייהו לא יוכל על זה ולא יסבול כל אותם היגונות לפי רתיחת מזג המיית הבחרות.

We see that the order of the statements in one version is reversed in the other. The editions have the order: Maimonides' experience and acquired wisdom (1), then Maimonides' readiness to forgive his offenders in contrast to his pupil (2), while the MS has the two statements in the order (2) and (1). Mention should also be made of the insertion in the MS of **ואמר עוד** between the two sentences, which clearly indicates that the MS in this portion is not intended to be the actual and full wording of the letter but rather an abridged version of the contents. Note

⁷⁰ This reading is found, as Dr. Freimann informs me, in the MS. Neophiti (s. above n. 61) instead of the reading in Munk p. 67 (*Kob.* 29⁴): **וכבר הייתי בשנותיך וביותר משנותיך** which does not make much sense.

⁷¹ In the MS clearly **וקאל**. Geiger, *Lit. Bl. d. Israel*. 1846 p. 136, in quoting the beginning of the letter from the MS reads erroneously **וקאר** and corrects it to **וקר**. Steinschneider's statement (*Cat. Bodl.* p. 1901) that this beginning in the MS corresponds to **אמר ממה שתרעהו** in the printed version is true only if taken in a broader sense, since the analysis shows that the sentence **אמר ממה שתרעהו** is missing in the MS altogether and the other sentences are arranged differently as we saw in our comparison of the two versions.

the difference in length and elaborateness between the two versions. The version of the short letter seems to be the middle between the two, more elaborate than the MS yet less than the editions, and, although containing mainly statement (2) of the editions the phrase 'וכבר הייתי בשנותיך וביותר משנותיך וכ' — preceded by השנים מחייבים לך — reminds one very distinctly of the statement (1) in which Maimonides speaks of himself, in contrast to the pupil, הכניעוני השנים (edit.) or הרגלוני השנים (MS — *Birk. Abr.*), although with some difference in the point. Thus the passages in the short letter may represent a sort of rearrangement of both statements in the two versions.⁷² At any rate these differences in order and phrasing suffice to support our view that the versions represent different collections of fragments which were preserved even in different phrasings.

Coming back now to our problem, namely the passage (14) speaking of the six installments of the first part of the *Moreh*, we may examine its weight for the dating of the *Moreh* in the light of our results as to the nature of our letter. If we assume that the letter, in either version, represents nothing but a collection of fragments of different letters written at different times and that even the individual fragments were preserved in a variety of phrasings, it will not be difficult to arrive at an evaluation of the chronological import of our passage. This passage (14) is missing in the printed editions and, following our conclusion with regard to the other passages omitted in one version or the other, we are justified in suspecting at once that this passage, too, might have been omitted in one version because of its chronological inconsistency.

But beyond this suspicion *per analogiam* the fact that this passage is totally out of place where it stands and evidently interrupts the logical trend of the context should convince us of its inappropriateness here. Maimonides is discussing in detail his arguments with the Baghdad scholars (up to passage 12),

⁷² If my surmise about the identity of the *Geṭ* matter in the short letter and in the MS version of the long letter is correct (see above n. 61), then also its place in the two letters is of interest for the transposition which we found in the other matters. The contexts in the two letters are altogether different.

which is continued in the editions with the passage (15) dealing with Joseph's plans to go to Baghdad and to establish there an institution of learning — a sequence which is perfectly logical. In the MS we find between these two passages 12 and 15 the passage 13, dealing with the *Treatise on Resurrection* which logically may well belong here in connection with the preceding; chronologically, however, it has proven to be in conflict with the preceding passage referring to Ibn Ġabbar as well as with the date at the end of the letter. Following 13 there is our passage 14 about the six installments of the *Moreh*, which certainly has nothing to do with the controversy in Baghdad, which precedes it, or with Joseph's plans to go to Baghdad, which follows it. This passage, at least from the point of view of logical sequence, is certainly a disturbing foreign body. And this logical difficulty should be of no less weight in favor of regarding this passage as an interpolation than is the chronological difficulty with regard to the immediately preceding passage (13).

In fact it is not difficult to reconstruct the psychological motives of the copyist in interpolating these two passages. After passage 12, which concludes with the question of עולם הבא and ימות המשיח, the continuation (passage 13) containing the discussion, or rather defense, concerning תחיית המתים⁷³ and including the announcement of the *Treatise* on this subject, seems to be logically quite fitting; and again following the statement at the end of 13, that the *Treatise* will "reach him soon," the passage (14) that the installments of the *Moreh* "had reached him already" easily attaches itself, seemingly in logical sequence, to the immediately preceding phrase, although undoubtedly out of harmony with the trend of the entire section of the letter.

Summing up, it seems that the two versions of the letter represent at least 7 different letters whose fragments are combined; namely:

⁷³ The beginning of our passage 13 on the *Treatise*, Munk, *Notice* p. 22 reads מע כוננא בי"א and this phrase connects it with the preceding as subordinate clause (translation p. 25: quoique nous nous sayons expliqués); yet in the MS HUC p. 195 it reads ומע כוננא בי"א and appears as a new concessive sentence only logically connected with the preceding. So apparently in Goldberg's MS, who translates ואף כי בארנו.

- (1) The Baghdad affair (fragments 1-3, 4, 6-12, 15-17) constituting the bulk of the letter, which however may still contain heterogeneous elements (as, for example, fragments 1, 2, and fragment 7 containing the נב incident),
- (2) The Ibn Ġabbar incident (passage 5),
- (3) The announcement of the *Treatise on Resurrection* (passage 13),
- (4) The statement about the installments of the *Moreh* (passage 14),
- (5) On Abraham (passage 18),
- (6) On the death of the little girl (passage 19),
- (7) One of the two endings (passage 21 or 22, probably the first); also passage 20 is questionable, especially if we take passage 21 as the original ending of the main letter.

At any rate the date Sel. 1503 in passage 22, after elimination of the passage on the *Treatise*, may well stand.

And since the passage about the *Moreh* most probably does not belong together with the dated ending of the letter and we do not know of any other date with which we might connect this passage, no conclusions whatsoever as to the date of the composition of the *Moreh* may be drawn from it.

The later datings of the completion of the *Moreh* also appear highly improbable for psychological reasons. Both theories, that of Graetz as well as that of Marx, have one feature in common: they assume the composition of substantial parts of the book at a time when one could expect from Maimonides anything but the physical and mental ability to write on such a work. According to Graetz, the parts two and three must have been written at a time when according to Maimonides' own description — if we take the letter as a unit — he was not even able to read a line in philosophy, when he could scarcely keep up with the necessary readings in medicine and only on Sabbaths could spare some time for Jewish reading.⁷⁴ How can it be

⁷⁴ See the vivid description in Munk, *Notice* p. 24 (tr. p. 30 f.). *Birk. Abr.* p. IX: ... ובזמן הנשאר לי מן היום ומן הלילות לא אוכל לקרות בספרי הרפואות כפי הצריך. . . וזאת היא הסבה אשר לא אוכל למצוא שעה לעיין בדבר מדברי תורה ולא אקרא כי אם ביום השבת בלבד אבל שאר החכמות לא אוכל למצוא שעה כלל לעיין בהם והגיע לי היוק רב מאוד מזה השער.

imagined, that just at that time he wrote two thirds of his *magnum opus* — since a year later it was already completed? Similarly, according to Marx's theory, the writing of the third part would fall just in that period of grave and protracted illness in which he could not even answer a letter.⁷⁵

Apart, therefore, from the objective reasons which disprove these theories or, at least, refute their proofs this psychological aspect should suffice to make us prefer any other period in Maimonides' life for an accomplishment such as the *Moreh* rather than these two periods, of which we happen to have more information than of any others, indicating that they were the least suitable for such a work. This psychological reason should make us suspicious even if we had a definite statement somewhere that the *Moreh* had been written during those periods — all the more so if, as in the case of Graetz, the entire conjecture is based upon a fragment which, with several others, was put together into a "letter", the date of which under all circumstances cannot agree with its contents.

There is nothing left, therefore, except to return to the traditional date of 1185, when Maimonides was close to fifty, as the date of the completion of the *Moreh*. This is the period immediately preceding his court appointment — certainly the most productive in his life. The fact that in the year 1189 he already showed the book to the non-Jewish visitor Abdullatif⁷⁶

⁷⁵ See letter to Jonathan *Kob*. I p. 12³: אם לא מדאנה מדבר החולי ומרוב: המהומות כמו שנה עמדתי בחליי ועכשו שנתרפאתי הרי אני כחולה שאין בו סכנה, ואני רוב היום מסב על המטה . . . ולא הניחו לי שעה אחת לא מן היום ולא מן הלילה . . . ועוד שאיני היום כמו בימי הבחרות אלא כחי כשל . . . וירי רעדה אפילו לכתוב אגרת קטנה אעצל וכ' וכ'. Similarly in the letter to the Lunel scholars, *Ginze Jeruśalaim* I p. 36; see quotation above n. 27. The same vein also in the well known letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon, *Kob*. II p. 28³, in reply to the latter's wish to visit him.

⁷⁶ See above n. 34 and n. 11. According to the report in De Sacy's edition, which Dernburg followed, Abdullatif visited Saladin's camp during the siege of Acca by the Franks which took place 1189-1191, and from there he went to Cairo where he met Maim. On the whole the presentation by Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Arab. Ärzte* p. 124, based on Abi Oseiba, agrees with this story, except for the misleading expression here "Unterdess hatte Salah ed-Din *Jerusalem erobert*," after the visit of Abdullatif in the Acca camp. Since the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin took place on Oct. 2, 1187, we are tempted to date Abdullatif's visit before Acca and also the subsequent

— especially as contrasted with his admonition sent with the six installments to Ibn Aknin not to let the book be seen by anyone⁷⁷ — only strengthens us in the view that at that time he had finished not only the first part of the *Moreh* but rather the entire book, and that several years before.

visit to Cairo at the time of Saladin's siege of Acca in June 1187 — which is not correct, since according to Wüstenfeld himself it was not until after 586 Heg.=1189 that Abdullatif came in contact with Saladin.

⁷⁷ See Munk, *Notice*, p. 23 (transl. p. 26 f.); Maim. was afraid not only of the נויים but also of the רשעי ישראל "who are many."

הערות והגהות בפירוש הרד"ק לתהלים

(מהדורת י"א אסתרסון, HUCA כרך X, ע' 310-443)

מאת יהודה פריס-חורב, תל אביב

באור ראשי התבות:

ד"א - פירוש תהלים לרד"ק דפוס איזנא ש"א.

דא"מ - דפוס אמסטרדם תקכ"ה.

ד"ו - דפוס ויניציא רע"ח.

ד"ק - פירוש הארוך לרד"ק מהדורת ר"ש שילרשינסי - קמברידזש תרמ"ג.

1. הקדמת הרד"ק עמוד 317 שורה 2 עתירות נכבדות (לרגלי) (לרגלים) מועדות, היות בה נסעדות. ד"ו, ד"ק.
2. שם שורה 4 ולי ירבה אונים, (מאור נאורים) (מאור נאורים). ד"ו, ד"ק.
3. שם שורה 5 וזהו (החלי) (החילי), בשם צורי (גואלי) (גואלי), ד"ו, ד"ק.
4. שם שורה 6 העיר המו"ל, בכל הספרים שבהם השתמשתי, נמצא השיר הזה - בהקדמת הרד"ק - רק בספר תהלים עם פירוש הרד"ק, אשר יצא לאור על ידי איציק שפייאר ברלין תקכ"צ. ובאמת נמצא גם בסוף ספר תהלים דפוס ויניציא רע"ח 1517 שהמו"ל השתמש בו, ובדפוס קמברידזש.
5. שם שורה 14 ואמרו - ורש"י בבא בתרא י"ד ע"ב - כי מזמור נאום ה' לאדוני, מלכי צדק אמרו.
6. מ"ב ב' ובדרש נדרש תהלים כ"ב י"ד האילה הזאת בשעה שהיא צמאה.
7. מ"ג ג' כמו (אראה) (ארעה) צאנך אשמור.
8. מ"ה י"ח (עמוד 334 שורה 23) ומה (שאמר) (שאמרו) כי לא יתכן לומר (כן על) (כן האל, על דבר שאינו ממין האלהות. ד"ו, ד"ק.
9. שם (עמוד 335 שורה 6) ואם יאמרו לך, כנגד הבשר (אמור להם) ואמרו, אחר שלקח האלהות הבשר, נואמר לבשר שישאל ממנו, "ויתן גוים נחלתו". לא היה זה, כי הבשר לא היה לו מלכות ולא שום שולטנות על גוי מהגויים. ד"ו, ד"ק תהלים סוף מזמור ב', והמיל השמיט מן "הבשר" עד "הבשר".

10. שם ואם ישאלו ממך פירושו, תפרשנו על אחד משני פנים איזה (שתבאר) ושתבחר ד"ו. ד"ק.
11. מ"ו ד' ויש מפרשים יחמרו מענין „בארות בארות חמר“, כלומר (יעברו) ניעכרו המים. רד"ק בספר השרשים שרש חמר, ומכלל יופי תהלים מ"ו, ד'.
12. מ"ח ג' ובדרש (פסיקתא רבתי פרשה מ"א) (מדרש תהלים מ"ח) יפה נוף, שהכל מִפִּין לה שלא היתה כמותה. (אמר המעיר: א) הדרש בשלמותו אינו נמצא אלא במדרש תהלים לא בפסיקתא רבתי. ב) דוק ותמצא שברב המקומות שהרד"ק בפירושו לתהלים אומר, ובדרש' כונתו למדרש תהלים דוקא.
13. שם (עמוד 341 שורה 3) (וְכִמָּה) וּבְכִמָּה היתה משמחת כל הארץ? כך הגירסא במדרש תהלים מהדורת ר"ש באבער.
14. מ"ח ט' (והוה) ווהוא הביא אלה הצבאות לירושלים. ד"ו, דא"מ.
15. נ' ד' ורז"ל ונסנהדרין צ"א ע"ב דרשו, יקרא אל השמים מעל, זו נשמה, ואל הארץ לדין עמו, זה הגוף.
16. נ' ה' וכן אמרו רבותינו ז"ל מהו כורתי בריתי עלי זבח? ביום שישראל עושים ברית מילה, עלי זבח הם עושים, שעושים שמחה ומְשִׁתָּה. לא ידעתי מקורו. ורבינו בחיי בפירושו ע"ת וירא כ"א ב', ובספרו כד הקמח ערך מילה, מביא את הדרש הזה משמיה דנפשיה. ועיין פרקי דר' אליעזר כ"ט. תנחומא חיי שרה ז'. תצוה א'. ושאלתי את חכמי ירושלים למקור מאמר רז"ל זה, המובא ברד"ק, ואין פותר אותו לי. על דברי רבינו בחיי הנ"ל העירני בטובו הרב רמ"מ כשר, תליאביב.
17. נ"א ז' כמו שאמרו (ברכות ס' ע"א) אשה כי תזריע וילדה זכר, אשה מזרעת תחלה וילדת זכר.
18. שם ח' ואמרו (ברכות ס"א ע"א) הלב מבין והכליות יועצות.
19. שם י"ד והרב הגדול והחכם הרמב"ם ז"ל (נהלכות תשובה פרק ששי הלכה ד'). פרש, תסמכני תניח רוחי הנדיבה לעשות חפצה וכו'.
20. שם ט"ז ודם נאמר בלשון יחיד כמו דם נקי, ובלשון רבים כמו קול דמי אחיך וגו', והטעם כתב החכם ראב"ע נקרא בלשון יחיד בעבור היותו אחד, ובלשון רבים כי הוא נושא את כל הארבעה יסודות. לא ידעתי מקורו. ובפירושו הרד"ק בראשית ד' י' מביא הרד"ק את הטעם הנ"ל משמיה דנפשיה.
21. נ"ב ב' ובדרש (מדרש תהלים נ"ב ד' מנוכח למעלה אדומים היה, ועל שם עירו נקרא. ובמדרש תהלים נ"ב ד' מהדורות ר"ש באבער משובש: „מעיר (נוב עד) (נוכח) למעלה אדומים (יהושע ט"ז ז'. י"ח י"ז) היה.“
22. נ"ח ז' אבל היונה בשעה שיגיעה היא קופצת (אחד) (אחת) מאנפיה, ופורחת (באחד) (באחת) והיא נצולת.
23. נ"ה ט"ז כי רעות במגורם בקרבם, הרעות שחושבים בקרבם

אומרים במגורם. ופירושו במקום אסיפתם וכו'. וכן יגורוהו בחרמו (חבוק א' ט"ו). (ובית זונה יתגוררו (ירמיה ה' ז'). [ועל דגן ותירוש יתגוררו (הושע ז' י"ד)] והדומים להם לשון אסיפה. כך נראה לי להניח עפ"י ספר השרשים לרד"ק שורש גור. ומכלל יופי — ש ר ו ב ו מיוסד כידוע, על דברי הרד"ק — תהלים נ"ה ט"ז. אבל ובית זונה יתגוררו (ירמיה ה' ז') כתוב ב ד' הביאו הרד"ק בשורש גדר, ואין ענינו כלל לכאן.

והא לך עוד שלש הגהות ברד"ק:

א. תהלים י"ח י"ב: חשכת מים, ובשמואל (כ"ב י"ב) חשרת מים, שענינו קשור העננים. (מתרגום וחשוקיהם (שמות כ"ז י') וחשוריהון). [כמו וחשוקיהם וחשוריהם הכל מוצק]. (מלכים א' ז' ל"ג). גירסא ישרה זו מצאתי בשרשים לרד"ק שרש חשר, ובפירוש הרד"ק שמואל ב' כ"ב י"ב. ומשובש בכל הדפוסים הראשונים. ודלא כר"ש שילרשינסי שנכנס בדחוקים עיין שם.

ב. תהלים י"ח מ"ג: או יהיה מענין (רקוק בשר) [רקות בשר] (בראשית מ"א י"ט). כך הגירסא בשרשים לרד"ק שרש רוק. ומכלל יופי תהלים י"ח. ומשובש בכל הדפוסים העתיקים ובר"ש שילרשינסי.

ג. יחזקאל י"ג י"ח: ואצילי, הם בית השחי (וכתיב) [צ"ל וכת"י, ר"ח=וכן תרגם יונתן] על כל מרפקי (ידיו) [ידין]. ובעל ערוך השלם ערך מרפק הביא את פירוש הרד"ק, ולא עמד על השבוס שבמלת, וכתיב'.

24. נ"ה י"ח וכן אמרו רז"ל, בראשית רבא פרשה (ס"ה) וס"ח ט"ז צריך אדם להתפלל שלש פעמים ביום, כנגד שלש פעמים שהיום משתנה.

25. נ"ה כ"ג ויש מפרשים יהבך כמו נתנך, כלומר השלך (עצמך) וצרכוך על האל אשר נתן לך עד היום הזה, והוא יכלכלך. כך הגירסא בשרשים לרד"ק שורש יהב.

26. נ"ו י"א וכן מצאתי במדרש (בראשית רבא פרשה י"ב) [מדרש תהלים נ"ו ג'] מקום שנאמר אלהים, מדת הדין וכו', ובמקום שנאמר ה', הוא מדת הרחמים וכו', אמר דוד: אם במדת הדין אתה דן אותי אני מקלסך, ואם במדת הרחמים אתה דן אותי, אני מקלסך. ובמדרש תהלים נ"ו ג' מהדורת ר"ש באבער משובש: אם במדת הדין אתה דן [אותי], אני (מקבלך) [מקלסך]. וכו'. ואם במדת הרחמים אתה דן [אותי] אני (מקבלך) [מקלסך].

27. נ"ו י"ב וכמו ויברך כל בשר, יבוא כל בשר להשתחוות, שהוא (אמר) [נאומר] על האדם. ד"ו. ד"א. דא"מ.

28. נ"ו י"ד וכן במדרש (מדרש תהלים נ"ו בסופו) להתהלך לפני אלהים, (בארצות החיים) זו ארץ ישראל, באור החיים, זה גן עדן. כך הגירסא העיקרית. ותיבות "בארצות החיים" הן אשגרא דלשנא מתהלים קט"ו ט'. וליתא בד"ו ד"א. דא"מ. והגירסא הישרה נמצאת לנכון במדרש תהלים מהדורת ר"ש באבער, וכצ"ל שם: "להתהלך לפני אלהים: (באור החיים) בארץ ישראל, באור החיים: באור הגדול שבגן עדן. ור"ש באבער במכ"ת שבש על מנת לחקן, ע"פי הגירסא המשובשת שבילקוט תהלים רמז חשע"ה.

29. נ"ח י' ופירוש יבינו, יפריחו, וכן במשנה [תוספתא מעשר ראשון פרק א' ד' מהדורת צוקרמנדל עמוד 181] הסיאה והאזוב משיבינו. וידוע שהראשונים ז"ל רש"י, ר' יונה אבן גנאח, והרמב"ן ועוד, היו רגילים לכנות את התוספתא משנה. וכך הגירסא בתוספתא כתי' ווינא. עיין הנהגות אור הגנוז על התוספתא בש"ס דפוס ראם ווילנא. שבישתא כיון דעל, על: עיין פירוש המאירי לתהלים, הוצאת, מקיצי נרדמים ירושלים תרצ"ו, עמוד 115 הערה 2, וזה לשונו: ופירוש יבינו, יפריחו. וכן במשנה הפיאה וה' משיבינו, ר"ל משיפריחו. ר' יוסף הכהן, המו"ל של המאירי לתהלים, לא הרגיש שפירוש המאירי כאן, — כמו רב פירוש של המאירי לתהלים — נובע מפירוש הרד"ק הארוך לתהלים, וגם לא העיר כלל על המקור, שבתוספתא, וכז"ל: וכן במשנה [תוספתא מעשר ראשון א' ד'], (הפיאה וה') (הסיאה והאזוב) משיבינו.

30. נ"ט ז' ואמר וישובבו עיר, והם היו מסבבים הבית (בעבורי) [בעבורו].

31. ס' ב' סוף עמוד 387 ובדרש אחר (מדרש תהלים ס') [תנחומא דברים סוף סימן ג'] אמר טעם וישב יואב, ואמר כי שתי מלחמות היו בגיא מלח.

32. ס' ט' ובדרש [ילקוט שמעוני תשע"ט] ופרקי ר' אליעזר פרק י"ז כשעתיד הקב"ה לקבץ גלויות, ראשון הוא מקבץ גלעד.

33. ס"ב י"ג ונאמר [עזרא ט' י"ג] כי אתה (ה') אלהינו (חשבת) [חשכת] למטה מעונו. אבל גם במדרש תהלים ובילקוט המכירי תהלים כאן, הגירסא חשבת בבי"ת. ועיין עזרא ט' י"ג בתנ"ך מהדורת גינצבורג. הוצאה גדולה.

34. ס"ד ג' ותרגום והשבתי המון מצרים, (ואטיל) [ואבטיל] ית אתרגוש מצרים.

35. ס"ד ד' בכל הדפוסים: ויניציא רע"ח, איזנא ש"א, אמסטרדם תקכ"ה חסר פירוש הרד"ק על הפסוק ס"ד ד'. ונמצא לנכון אך ורק בפירוש הרד"ק לתהלים מהדורת ר"א אסתרסון.

36. ס"ד ז' מוקשים (פרושו) ופרשון ללכדני בהם.

37. ס"ה ג' לך לבדך תאות התהלה שמהללים לך, כי יותר יש בך ממה שמהללים (בך) [בה לך] ד"ו.

38. ס"ה ז' ואמר [תהלים ל"ז ז'] (בהררי) [וכהררי] אל, שבהם נראה כחו. ועיין רד"ק לקמן סוף פסוק י' סוף עמוד 406.

39. ס"ז י"ב (ואתה) [ועתה] הרכבת והשלטת אומות העולם לראשנו, ד"ו, ד"א.

40. ס"ט י' כי קנאת ביתך: שהם מושלים (בך) [בז] ואני בחוץ. ד"ו, ד"א.

41. ס"ט ט"ז ואל (תעטר) [תאטר] עלי.

42. ס"ט כ"ח תנה להם עונש על עונם [שעון] [שעון] בנו. ד"ו, ד"א וכז"ל למטה בהערה 232.

43. ס"ט ל"ה (יהללוך) [ניהללוהו] שמים וארץ.

44. ע"א ג' לצור מעון. למטה בהערה 22 (מעון) [נמעון] א ב ג ד.
 45. ע"א ז' והחכם ראב"ע פרש הטעם בעבור שנשמכתי עליך, ואתה (לא) סמכתני הייתי כמופת לרבים שלא היו מאמינים בכך. יר הנירסא בראב"ע שלפנינו.
 46. ע"ב ג' ובדרש ומדרש תהלים ע"ב ג' כיון שידין עמך בצדק, יהיה שובע בעולם.
 47. ע"ב כ' עמוד 442 שורה 10 ואם על האלהות, הרי יש (לומר) ולו למה שאל מה שיש לו. ד"ו.

GRAMMATICAL ELEMENTS AND TERMINOLOGY IN RASHI'S COMMENTARIES

Part II

RASHI'S VOWEL TERMINOLOGY¹

HENRY ENGLANDER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati

THE vowel ֿ is referred to by the term *pataḥ*.² R has the plural of this term, namely, פתחין in connection with a masoretic observation.³ Letters vocalized with a *pataḥ* are said to be פתוחין.⁴ It has been maintained that R, at times, employs the term *pataḥ* when actually he is referring to the vowel ֿ . The few passages that have given this impression will be discussed later.⁵

¹ Special abbreviations to be noted are: R=Rashi; D=Dunash b. Labrat His Criticisms of Menahem b. Saruk; M=Menahem b. Saruk. Part I of this study is in *HUCA*, Vol. XI, 1936.

² On Ex. 5.16; Lev. 22.10; Jud. 5.29 and thus often.

³ See on Hos. 4.8; see also Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 62, col. a, lines 1, 2. The *Mahberet* of M, which is of supreme importance in helping us to understand many of R's grammatical comments that touch upon forms that are derived from weak roots, does not give us adequate or certain light on some of his vowel terms. Some of these terms are found on p. 4a, lines 8-9, *infra*. The partial list given there is interrupted by other matter and is then continued on p. 7b, lines 6, 7. The terms on these pages are: קמץ גדול. קמץ קטן. פתח גדול חטף. פתח קטן חטף. נקידה. פתיחה. קבוצה. פשוטה. ושבא. Some of these terms are identifiable; a few leave us in doubt as to the vowel that is implied by a term. Unfortunately M was not given to the use of vowel terms when discussing certain forms as was D. For a discussion and possible identification of the doubtful terms, see Siegmund Gross, *Menahem ben Saruk*, Breslau, 1872, pp. 79-80. As the work of D was before R we shall chiefly cite him in connection with R's vowel terminology. For the vowel terms in other early works, see pp. 510-512.

⁴ On Ex. 28.11.

⁵ See p. 517 ff.

The vowel $\bar{\text{v}}$ is also referred to as *pataḥ*,⁶ or as *pataḥ kaṭan*,⁷ or as *segol*.⁸ The rare occurrence of the last term in R's commentaries and the question as to whether R actually employed this term will be discussed later.⁹

The vowel $\bar{\text{v}}$ in R bears the current name, namely *hireḳ*.¹⁰

The vowel $\bar{\text{v}}$ when long is referred to as *ḵamez*,¹¹ or *ḵamez gadol*.¹² The same vowel when short is termed *ḵatef ḵamez*.¹³

⁶ See on Isa. 3.24, 32.10, 40.24; Hos. 11.7; Eccl. 12.14; Hab. 3.9; Ps. 10.3; Prov. 13.23; Job 36.33.

⁷ Gen. 41.35; Nu. 6.5; 11.8; 23.20; Eccl. 5.7, 19. The term *pataḥ* in the Masorah may refer either to a *pataḥ* or *segol*; see Frensdorff, *op. cit.*, p. 11. Cp. D, p. 59, line 2, *infra*, where letters that are vocalized with a $\bar{\text{v}}$ are said to be פתוחים בפתיחה קטנה. See also Rashbam on Gen. 32.26.

⁸ See on 2 Ki. 17.6; Joel 2.5; Ps. 150.5. This term is also found in a number of texts in the comment on Gen. 6.3. Berliner's text *ad loc.* is without this term.

⁹ See p. 514.

¹⁰ On Ex. 1.20; 3.22; Isa. 1.17; Lam. 2.5. In early literature this term is frequently spelled without the *yod*.

¹¹ Ex. 5.16; Isa. 1.16, 32.17. R's comment on Nah. 1.1 clearly implies that his text had the reading $\bar{\text{v}}$ and not $\bar{\text{v}}$ as in our present text, for, he notes that the word is vocalized with a *ḵamez* because it is not in the construct state.

¹² Nu. 11.8; Eccl. 3.16; Ps. 150.5. So also D, p. 70, line 4, *infra*; *ibid.*, p. 64, line 9, where the term is *kemizah gedolah*. For the view that R at times refers to this vowel by the term *pataḥ*, see p. 517 ff.

¹³ On Ex. 15.2, 19.24, 25.40; Jud. 5.9; 1 Sam. 1.9; Isa. 1.31; 12.2; Mic. 7.1; Ps. 118.14; Prov. 13.23. In the majority of these passages a distinction is drawn between the u segolate and participial forms, a distinction that was made by M who cites many u segolate forms and the corresponding participial forms; see M, p. 30; see also D, p. 59, sub הוֹצֵן. The term *ḵatef ḵamez* is found once in the current texts of R for the compound vowel in רָאִי (Gen. 16.23). However, this term is not found in Berliner's text in connection with that word. For R's terms for the compound vowels, see p. 507. [On Ps. 109.10, in the current texts but not in the Maarsen text, R applies the term *ḵatef ḵamez* to the *ḵamez* in דָּרְשׁוּ, which in our biblical text has a *meteg*. From Redak's comment on this form as well as from a statement in his Dictionary, it is clear that in Redak's text, even as in our current biblical texts, the word in question had a *meteg*, for he notes: וּמַלֵּךְ דָּרְשׁוּ נִקְרָא בְּקֶמֶץ רַחֵב כִּמוֹ שֶׁמֶרּוּ בִּן קִבְּלָנוּ קְרִיאָתָהּ. However, Redak also points to a reading without the *meteg*, for, in both Dictionary and comment he notes: וְנִתְּבַר רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב בֶּן אֱלֵעָזָר כִּי בִסְפֶר הַלְאִי כָּתוּב עָלָיו לִיחַ כּוֹחִיָּה חֲטָף. See Kimḥi's Dictionary, Biesenthal-Lebrecht, 1847, sub דָּרַשׁ; see also *Minḥat Šai*, *ad loc.*]

The vowel $\bar{\text{v}}$ is referred to by the term *kameṣ*,¹⁴ or *kameṣ kaṭan*,¹⁵ or *zere*.¹⁶ In R on Gen. 4.22 and Ex. 1.20 the terms *kameṣ kaṭan* (or merely *kameṣ*) and *zere* occur together, one term being identified by the other term. The possible significance of this dual terminology will be discussed later.¹⁷

The vowel $\dot{\text{v}}$ is termed מלא פֿום.¹⁸

The vowel $\underset{\cdot}{\text{v}}$ is termed *šureḳ*.¹⁹

THE SIMPLE AND COMPOUND *Šewa*

R's term for the simple *šewa* is *ḥatef*.²⁰ This term is employed also for the compound *pataḥ*,²¹ however, *ḥatef pataḥ* is R's usual term for this half vowel.²² This term is employed also for the compound *segol* in שְׁוֹלֵט.²³ Remembering that the term *pataḥ* is one of R's terms for the vowel $\bar{\text{v}}$, the corresponding half vowel is naturally referred to as *ḥatef pataḥ*. Some texts have the reading *ḥatef segol* in which reading, we believe, the term *pataḥ* was displaced by the term *segol*.²⁴

¹⁴ Nu. 11.8, 23.20; in the latter passage Berliner's text has *kameṣ kaṭan*: Isa. 3.24, 30.23, 40.24; Mic. 3.7; Ps. 10.3; Job 36.33; Eccl. 5.7. In the Masorah the term *kameṣ* may refer to a *zere*; see Frensdorff, *op. cit.*, p. 11. So also D, p. 32, line 5, *infra*; *ibid.*, p. 59, where in the last lines, the word קְמוּצִים refers to letters vocalized with a *zere*.

¹⁵ Gen. 41.35; Nu. 23.20; Lam. 2.5. Thus D, p. 70, sub. כֹּנֶה. On Lam. 2.5 the variant reading *pataḥ kaṭan* is found in some texts (e. g. Warsaw ed. 1880). For the probable reason for this variant see p. 515, n. 74.

¹⁶ Hos. 11.7, 12.9; Jer. 6.26.

¹⁷ See p. 516. The term *zere* is found in the current texts of R on Jer. 6.26 but is not found in the Hebrew Union College MS. dated 1271. The same MS., however, does have the term *zere* in the Hosea passages cited above. On the question as to the genuineness of this term in R, see p. 516.

¹⁸ Ex. 14.12; 15.2; 19.24; Isa. 1.31. In some texts the spelling is מלא פֿום as two words. C. Levias argues in favor of the spelling as one word; see *HUCA*, 1904, p. 140. It is so found in a number of early works. Ibn Ezra employs the term חֹלֶם, but he notes that others call it מלא פֿום. See *Sefer Zahot*, p. 1.

¹⁹ Ex. 15.2; Isa. 12.2; Ps. 118.14. So far as we are aware R had no special term for the long u vowel.

²⁰ Gen. 29.27; Ex. 22.19; Deut. 4.41; Job 11.17.

²¹ Ruth 1.19.

²² See on Gen. 4.9; Eccl. 1.2; 2 Sam. 7.7; Jer. 49.1; Zech. 7.5; Nah. 1.1.

²³ Joel 2.5.

²⁴ For a discussion of these variant readings see p. 514.

A DUAL VOWEL TERMINOLOGY

In the current texts of R on Ex. 3.22 we find the reading **בשבא בחטף**. One of these terms is clearly tautological. In Berliner's text the first of these terms is parenthesized. The term **שבא**, in all likelihood, was inserted by a later scribe by way of explaining the term **חטף** which, in later literature was not employed for the simple *šewa*.²⁵

A precisely similar case of conflation in Rashbam's commentary on the Pentateuch is found in his comment on Ex. 15.17 which reads **הדגש שבקו"ף של מקדש עושה את החטף שבא מניע**. David Rosin in connection with this passage wrote: "**שבא** hinter **חטף** in der Handschr. zu 1 Mos. 38.14 ist ein in Klammer hinzugefügte Erklärung von **חטף** erst seit der vierten Ausgabe.²⁶ **שבא** hinter **חטף** bereits in der Handschr. zu 2 Mos. 15.17 ist offenbar gleichfalls eine fremde Zuthat zur Erklärung von **חטף**."²⁷ In the year following his publication of "Rashbam as an Exegete," Rosin published his edition of Rashbam's commentary on the Pentateuch. In a note to Rashbam's text on Ex. 15.17, Rosin informs us that he changed his mind as to the term **שבא** being a gloss in the comment cited above. This change of mind, he informs us was due to the fact that he subsequently found the term **שבא** in M's *Mahberet*.²⁸ Rosin therefore concluded that possibly Rashbam likewise employed this term in his comment on Ex. 15.17. Rosin accordingly informs the reader that he withdraws the opinion previously expressed as to the term in question being a gloss. Rosin, however, is inconsistent in that he omits the term in the Genesis passage but retains it in the Exodus passage cited above.

²⁵ On Ezek. 2.2, in the Vienna ed., 1902, we find the term spelled **שוא**. In other texts the term in question is parenthesized thus indicating its character as a gloss. For the spelling of the term *šewa*, see W. Bacher, "Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik," *ZDMG*, Vol. XLIX, Part I, p. 18 (1891).

²⁶ This edition appeared in 1746.

²⁷ See David Rosin, *R. Samuel B. Meir als Schrifterklärer*, p. 130 n. 14, Breslau, 1880.

²⁸ P. 7, line 6. As a matter of fact this term is found in the *Mahberet* two times, the first as given above by Rosin and the second on p. 16a, line 8, *infra*; there, however, spelled **שבה**.

Early medieval exegetical and grammatical literature is replete with instances of a dual vowel terminology. This fact calls for an explanation. We do not deal with the question as to which term is the earlier and which the later, nor do we attempt to deal with the difficult and obscure problem of the place of origin of certain terms. We are interested primarily in giving a plausible explanation of the phenomenon of a dual terminology in one and the same passage, referring to one and the same vowel. How did it come about that two different terms were employed in a comment referring to a particular vowel in a particular word? We take the very view which Rosin subsequently rejected as the answer to this question, namely, that one of terms was inserted by way of explanation of the other term which had become obsolete. This conclusion becomes fairly certain when we learn from Rosin's own testimony that the term *šewa* did not appear in the Rashbam text until the fourth edition thereof. This can mean only that the current term שְׁבָא was inserted to explain the term הֶטֶף which had become obsolete as a term for the simple *šewa*. This explanation also holds good for the dual term in R's comments referred to above in which the term שְׁבָא is found in parentheses in Berliner's text.

It is most unlikely that two different vowel terms, set side by side as in the passages cited, were originally employed by an author for one and the same vowel in a particular word. On the other hand we find not infrequently passages in various early works, in which one term is explained or identified by another term for the same vowel. The significance of such passages will be discussed later. We also find quite frequently in medieval lexical, grammatical and exegetical works one term for a certain vowel and again another term for the same vowel in another passage but in the same context. A limited survey of the terms employed for the vowels פָּ and פֿ by various authors will possibly justify certain conclusions. It is mainly in connection with these two vowels that we find a dual terminology. The terms *pataḥ* פָּאָת and *ḵameṣ* פֿאָת for the vowels פָּ and פֿ respectively, will be designated in the following survey by the letter A, and the corresponding terms *segol* and *zere* will be designated by the letter B.

Masorah: The term *pataḥ* may refer to the vowel ֿ or ֿֿ ; the term *kameṣ* may refer to the vowel ֿֿֿ or ֿֿֿֿ .²⁹

Ben Asher:³⁰ At the close of section 10 a list of vowels is given, among them being the terms *segol* and *zere*. These terms, however, do not occur again in the work proper. The vowels in question as in some other works are referred to by שלוש נקודות, קמצה קטנה, פתחה קטנה, or, by שתי נקודות, or, by א' and א',³² or, by קמצה קטנה, פתחה קטנה, or, by קמצה קטנה, פתחה קטנה, or, by קמצה קטנה, פתחה קטנה.³³ P. Kahle³⁴ points out that the important codex 19a, dated 1009, does not contain the list of vowels as given in sec. 10. He, therefore, does not hold them to be original, even as, before him, M. Lambert regarded them as a later insertion.³⁵

Hayyuj: In his two treatises on the Weak and Geminative roots³⁶ only the B terms are employed in the Arabic original; but in the third treatise dealing with the vowels only the A terms are employed.³⁷

*Dunash: His Criticisms of M.*³⁸ Only the A terms are employed.³⁹

The Controversies Between the Disciples of M and the Disciples of D:⁴⁰ Only the A terms are employed.⁴¹

Dunash Against Saadia:⁴² Both the A and B terms are employed.⁴³

²⁹ See S. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 11 (in section on the masoretic terms).

³⁰ דקדוקי הטעמים, S. Baer and H. L. Strack, Leipzig, 1879.

³¹ See e. g., sec. 36.

³² See e. g., sec. 39; in this survey we shall ignore these ways of designation.

³³ See e. g., sec. 10, p. 11.

³⁴ In Bauer-Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*, 1922, p. 96, n. 1.

³⁵ See *REJ*, XVIII, p. 123.

³⁶ Ed. Morris Jastrow, Jr., 1897.

³⁷ Ed. J. W. Nutt, 1870, pp. I-XV, after p. 132.

³⁸ *Sefer Tešubot Ben Labraṭ*, Filipowski, 1855.

³⁹ See pp. 59, 97 (פתחה קטנה) and pp. 25, 59, 75 (קמצה קטנה). Hence a letter vocalized with the vowel ֿֿֿֿ is said to be פתוח (see p. 32, line 3 *infra*); and one vocalized with the vowel ֿֿֿֿֿֿ is said to be קמוח. See p. 37, line 6.

⁴⁰ *Sefer Tešubot*; ed. S. G. Stern, Vienna, 1870.

⁴¹ See e. g., Part I, pp. 52, 53; Part II, pp. 19, 25.

⁴² *Sefer Tešubot Dunash Halevi 'al Sa'adia Gaon*, ed. R. Schröter, Breslau, 1866. As to the genuineness of this work, see Michael Wilensky's *Who Was the Author of The Criticism against Sa'adia?* *JQR*, Vol. XXIV, 3.

⁴³ See e. g., §108^o (*segol*), and §107 where the term *zere* occurs seven

Jonah ibn Janah: (a) Grammar:⁴⁴ The B terms occur far more frequently than the A.⁴⁵ (b) Dictionary:⁴⁶ A and B terms in different passages;⁴⁷ A and B terms in the very same passage in which in one term is explained or identified by another term for the same vowel.⁴⁸

Ibn Ezra: Both the A and B terms occur in the *Sefer Moznayim*, the B terms are comparatively few.⁴⁹ In his *Safah Berurah* and *Sefer Zahot* only the A terms occur.⁵⁰

Joseph Kimhi:⁵¹ The B terms are employed except in the few passages in which one term is explained or identified by another term.⁵²

Moses Kimhi:⁵³ Only B terms; except in one passage in which the A terms are explained by the B terms.⁵⁴

times, and, in addition is found again in the same section in the following passage in which two terms for the same vowel occur; the passage reads: . . . מן הקטץ אל הצרי שהוא מן הקטץ גדול לקטץ קטן. This is one of a number of similar passages found in other works in which one term is explained or identified by another term for the same vowel.

⁴⁴ *Sepher ha-qetza* (כתאב אללמא), ed. Michael Wilensky, Vol. I, Berlin, 1929, Vol. II, 1931.

⁴⁵ For *patah kaṭan*, see e. g., pp. 126, line 12; 245, lines 20, 27; for *kameṣ kaṭan*, see e. g., p. 100, line 5. For B terms see e. g., pp. 277, line 20; 346, line 13 (*segol*) and p. 345, lines 4, 11, 16 (*zere*).

⁴⁶ *Sepher ha-reshim*, Translation by Judah ibn Tibbon, ed. W. Bacher, Berlin, 1893.

⁴⁷ See e. g., p. 72, line 14, p. 75, line 3; p. 75, line 3 for B.

⁴⁸ See e. g., p. 77, lines, 1, 2; 100, line 5.

⁴⁹ See e. g., pp. 9a and 10b where both the terms *patah kaṭan* (5 times) and *zere* occur in the same context. For *zere*, see 13b, 21a; for *kameṣ kaṭan*, see 10a (tres). For a dual terminology in the same passage, see pp. 2b, 8b.

⁵⁰ Both of these works edited by Gabriel Lippmann, Fürth, 1827 and 1839 respectively.

⁵¹ *Sefer Zikkaron*, ed. W. Bacher, Berlin, 1888.

⁵² For B terms see e. g., pp. 42, line 22; 49, line 6 (⌣); 36, line 13; 37, line 26 (⌣). For a dual terminology in the same passage explaining one term by another see p. 56, line 4; *ibid.*, line 14; p. 17, line 9. In connection with the last passage cited, Bacher (in note 4) calls attention to the fact that two of the three MSS. that he collated have the reading צרי הנקרא קטץ. Despite this fact Bacher has only the term *zere* in his text proper.

⁵³ *Sefer Mahalak*.

⁵⁴ P. 12b.

David Kimhi:⁵⁵ A and B terms.⁵⁶

Samuel b. Meir:⁵⁷ A and B terms.⁵⁸

Summarizing the survey made we find that the following employ only the A terms: Ben Asher,⁵⁹ Dunash against Menaḥem b. Saruḡ, the Controversies between the Disciples of Menaḥem and the Disciples of Dunash; Ḥayyuj in his *Sefer Hanikkud* in the Arabic original; Ibn Ezra's *Sefer Zəhot* and *Safah Berurah*. All the other works mentioned employ both the A and the B terms.⁶⁰ Generally speaking the B terms predominate in those works that employ both terms.

Two explanations for this phenomenon have been offered. Paul Kahle⁶¹ maintains: "Allmählich dringen die uns geläufigen Vokalnamen durch. Seit wann sie üblich sind, ist nicht zu sagen, da man damit rechnen muss, dass die später allgemein verwendeten Namen in ältere Schriften eingetragen sind." He observes that in Ḥayyuj all the vowel terms now current are found.⁶² Kahle argues that if the terms *segol* and *zere* had originally been in the text of Ḥayyuj, ibn Ezra would surely have named these vowels in his *Sefer Zəhot* in which he discusses the vowels in detail. According to Kahle then, the terms that we call B, and which Kahle believes to be later terms, displaced the A terms, which Kahle believes to be the earlier terms.

⁵⁵ *Sefer Miklol*, ed. Rittenberg, Lyck, 1842.

⁵⁶ For A terms see e. g., 2b, 9b; for B see, e. g., 7a, 9b. For dual terms in one passage for the vowels in question see, e. g., 136a. The A terms are rarely employed.

⁵⁷ His Commentary on the Pent., ed. David Rosin, Breslau, 1881.

⁵⁸ See on Gen. 32.26; Ex. 8.25 *pataḥ kaṭan*; for the compound vowel $\overline{\text{a}}$, his term is naturally *ḥaṭef pataḥ kaṭan*: see on Ex. 16.23. For the term *zere*, see *ibid*. On Gen. 49.5 we find a dual terminology for the vowel $\overline{\text{a}}$. Rosin points out that he found this dual terminology in five MSS., however, in the Ex. passage cited, only the term *zere* occurs.

⁵⁹ Excluding the list of vowels at the end of section 10, see above. p. 510.

⁶⁰ In Moses Kimhi's *Mahalak* the A terms occur but once in a passage that identifies one term by another. See above, p. 511.

⁶¹ In Bauer-Leander's *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache*, p. 97, 1922, Halle.

⁶² In the Arabic text of Ḥayyuj on the vowels as noted above he employs only the A terms in contrast to the employment of only B terms in his treatises on the Weak and Geminative roots.

If this explanation is correct, we raise the question, why do we find in Ibn Ezra's *Sefer Moznayim* both the A and B terms employed indiscriminately?⁶³ This question also holds for the criticisms by Dunash of Saadia,⁶⁴ and for D. Kimhi.⁶⁵ If Kahle's view is correct we must infer that the displacement of the B terms by the A terms was not carried through consistently, as was the case, according to Kahle in Hayyuj's treatises on the Weak and Geminative Roots. Michael Wilensky on the other hand comes to the conclusion: "Es kann sich höchstens um eine Koexistenz beider Arten von Namen nebeneinander handeln."⁶⁶

However, it is difficult to believe that when vowel terms were first invented, two different terms should have been invented and employed for one and the same vowel in one and the same region. The use of a dual terminology in one and the same work, we are inclined to believe, came about only gradually. May it not be possible to account for such a dual terminology in one and the same work for one and the same vowel, by assuming that in certain places the terms *segol* and *zere* were in current use, while in other places the corresponding terms, namely, *pataḥ kaṭan* and *kameṣ kaṭan* were employed. Then, as the literature of one place employing one set of vowel terms became known in other places where another set of terms was current, there came about the use by some authors of both the A and B terms indifferently in one and the same work. Only in this sense can we accept Wilensky's suggested possibility of a "Koexistenz" of two different terms for the very same vowel.

The many passages that occur, some of which we have cited, in which both A and B terms occur in one passage, and in which the one term is identified by the other corresponding term, surely implies a period when one of the terms needed explanation or identification. It implies, we believe, a transition from the employment of one set of vowel terms to another, corresponding set of vowel terms. How otherwise account for the not infrequent occurrence of passages in which one term is identified by another

⁶³ See above, p. 511.

⁶⁴ See above, p. 510.

⁶⁵ See above, p. 511.

⁶⁶ *Ein Beitrag z. Geschichte d. tiberiensischen Punctuation*, ZATW Vol XLII, p. 273 ff.

term? Certain it is that at some time, probably varying in different localities, the terms *segol* and *zere* ultimately displaced the use of the A terms, as is to be seen in the now universal use of only the B terms. The gradual process of first explaining and then displacing one term by another can be seen for example in Rashi's text on Ex. 3.22. The current texts have **בשבא בחטף**. One of these terms, as previously observed, is clearly tautological.⁶⁷ In Berliner's text the term **שבא** is parenthesized indicating its absence from some of the manuscripts. In Rashi on Ex. 15.2 both terms are set side by side without one of the terms being parenthesized, this undoubtedly by way of identifying one term by another. That this is so can be demonstrated in connection with Rashbam's comment on Gen. 38.14, in which the dual terminology *ḥatef šewa* occurs in current texts. Rosin, the editor of Rashbam's text, informs us that the term *šewa* did not appear in the Rashbam text until the fourth edition thereof (i. e. in 1746). The conclusion is inevitable that the term *šewa* originally parenthesized, was added by way of identifying the term *ḥatef*.⁶⁸

The next step was the omission of the A term altogether, as in Rashi on Job 11.17, where only the term **שבא** occurs.

A clear case of the substitution of a B for an A term is evident in the two variant readings for the vowel $\overline{\text{v}}$ **אָרִיךְ**.⁶⁹ It will be recalled that Rashi employs almost exclusively the term *pataḥ* or *pataḥ ḵatan* for the vowel $\overline{\text{v}}$. Therefore, naturally, the corresponding compound vowel is termed *ḥatef pataḥ*.⁷⁰ Some Rashi texts, however, read *ḥatef segol*, in which the term *segol* no doubt displaced the term *pataḥ*.⁷¹ We are compelled to this conclusion by reason of the fact that the vowel $\overline{\text{v}}$, with only three exceptions in all of Rashi's commentaries, is always called *pataḥ* or *pataḥ ḵatan*. The two other occurrences of the term *segol* are in the comments on 2 Ki. 17.6 and Ps. 150.5. The very rare occurrence of this term in R is suspicious in itself.

⁶⁷ See above, p. 508.

⁶⁸ See above, p. 508. Rosin, in his text of Rashbam, omits the first of these two terms.

⁶⁹ Joel 2.5.

⁷⁰ Rashbam on Ex. 16.23 calls this compound vowel *ḥatef pataḥ ḵatan*.

⁷¹ See e. g., the so-called Mendelssohn Bible, Vienna, 1817.

We are therefore inclined to believe that the term *segol* in Rashi is a later substitution for a term which in time became obsolete.⁷² In the case of the former passage we have indirect proof that the term is not original in that passage, that is, if the text is genuinely Rashi's. In the comment on 2 Ki. 17.6 the statement is made that the form וַיִּל is equivalent to וַיִּלָּה. The comment then proceeds to point out the difference in the vocalization of the *yod* in the ל"ה apocopated forms of the *kal* and the *hiph'il*.⁷³ The comment notes that in the *hiph'il* the *yod* is vocalized with a ׀. But this statement directly contradicts what is said in the somewhat parallel comments on Ex. 1.20 and Lam. 2.5, in which passages Rashi specifically notes that the *yod* in the apocopated *hiph'il* forms is vocalized with a *kamez* *kaṭan*, that is, with the vowel ׀.⁷⁴

There can be no doubt whatever that Rashi's comment on Ex. 1.20 clearly means that the *yod* of the ל"ה apocopated forms with *waw* consecutive in the *hiph'il* Imperfect, third singular masculine is vocalized with the vowel ׀, for the text word that inspired his comment is וַיִּטֵּב, vocalized with the vowel ׀ under the *yod* in the *hiph'il* apocopated ל"ה forms. Added and conclusive proof that in Rashi's text a form like וירב in the *hiph'il* was vocalized with a *zere* under the *yod*, is R's observation that this form is not to be taken to be a form like וַיִּלָּד, because,

⁷² On Gen. 6.3 in the current R texts the term *segol* occurs, but is not found in Berliner's text. The word under comment is בָּשָׁנִים which R notes is equivalent to בָּשָׁנִים.

⁷³ The comment reads: וזה שיעור כל חיבה שפעל שלה בה'א כגון גלה, לשבא לתה בראש התיבה וי' יו'ד אם המלה מוסבת על הפעל תהא היו'ד נקודה בחיריק. . . ואם הוא מרבר בל' מפעיל תהא היו'ד נקודה בסגול. We have the impression that this comment is not altogether genuinely Rashi's. Phrases such as המלה מוסבת על הפועל and וזה שיעור are not characteristic of Rashi.

⁷⁴ In the Warsaw ed. of 1800 and a few other eds., in the comment on Lam. 2.5, the reading is *pataḥ kaṭan* in place of *kamez kaṭan* found in most of the texts. This, we believe, to be an adjustment of the vowel term to the present vocalization of וַיִּרָב. In a note in the edition of the Pentateuch with Rashi's Commentary, Translated into English by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silverman, Vol. II, p. 228, n. 2, London, 1930, it is said: "Rashi includes under the terms קמץ קטן and צירי both our Segol and Zere which are sometimes vowels of the same class." So far as we are aware both קמץ קטן and צירי apply only to the vowel ׀.

as R observes, forms like the latter are from a different root in which the letter *yod* is a root letter.⁷⁵

In the comment just considered we find the two terms for the vowel ֿ . The passage reads: קמץ קטן [בצירי שהוא] נקוד הי"ד. In Berliner's text one of the terms is parenthesized which probably indicates the absence of that term in some of the manuscripts that he collated. However, in the current texts of Rashi the term *zere* is not parenthesized. In the closely parallel comment on Lam. 2.5, we find only Rashi's usual term for the vowel ֿ , namely *kamez katan*. The term *zere* standing alone is found in Rashi's commentaries only three times, namely in his comments on Hos. 11.7; 12.9; Jer. 6.26.⁷⁶

The rare occurrence of the term *zere* in R's commentaries, as over against the frequent employment by R of the term *kamez* or *kamez katan*, leads us to believe that here also the term *zere*, which ultimately came to be used exclusively for the vowel ֿ , displaced R's usual designation for that vowel. The process of the transition from the use of the A to the B terms, not by R himself, can be glimpsed from the following facts. R's comment on חרש⁷⁷ in the earlier Berliner text reads: אינו לשון פועל (vocalization ours) אלא לשון פועל (vocalization Berliner's). In a number of R texts we find the term *zere* after the word פועל. Originally this B term was parenthesized as is still the case in a number of texts. The parenthesis in some texts in due time was omitted, whereupon the B term came to appear as being R's own term. In this passage the term *kamez katan* was also retained, but, in the course of time in the three passages noted above, the term *zere* came to stand alone. Are we not justified in assuming that in these passages the A term was displaced by the B term, or was inserted in the R text in which no vowel term was originally employed as is the case with the term *segol* that was inserted in most of the texts of R on Gen. 6.3?⁷⁸

⁷⁵ For R's view of the trilateral root character of ל"ה forms, see Englander, *HUCA*, Vol. VIII, p. 403, 1930.

⁷⁶ In the MS. at the H. U. C. Library from the year 1271 the term *zere* is not found in connection with Rashi's comment on the last of these three passages.

⁷⁷ See R on Gen. 4.22.

⁷⁸ See above, p. 515. For a typical instance of the insertion in the R text

QUESTION AS TO RASHI'S EMPLOYING THE TERM PATAH
WHEN REFERRING TO A KAMEZ.

It has been maintained that R at times employs the term *patah* when actually he is referring to a *kamez*.⁷⁹ Well known is the fact that in some early works where we expect to find the vowel פָּ, we find the vowel פַּ. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that in some places no distinction was made in the pronunciation of these vowels. However, the belief that R "made no distinction whatever between פתח גדול and קמץ גדול" is not at all justified by the facts. There are three biblical and two talmudic passages, so far as we are aware, that might give the impression that R did employ the term *patah* when referring to a *kamez*.⁸⁰ Granting that in every one of these passages the text of R employs the term *patah* when reference is actually to a *kamez*, this would not justify the conclusion that this practice was common with R and that he makes no distinction whatever between *kamez gadol* and *patah*. It is possible that such a conclusion was based upon a misunderstanding of R, or that a passage in which the vowel is called *patah* may have been inserted in the text of R.

A clear case of this latter assumption is found in R on Gen. 29.27, in which the vocalization of שָׁבוּעַ in the absolute and construct state is pointed out. In the latter form, the comment points out that the letter שׁ is vocalized with a *ḥatef*, i. e., with

of the term *zere*, see the Supercommentary ספר באר רחובות by Isaac Auerbach on Ex. 23.27. R's comment is cited in full, with the addition however of the term *zere*, without any indication that the term is an insertion.

⁷⁹ So Phineas Mordell in his review of P. Kahle's *Masoreten des Westens*, II, in the *JQR*, Vol. XXIV, No. 3, p. 278, 1934. He writes: "As a matter of fact, neither the Sephardim of today or of olden times ever made any distinction in pronunciation even between the Tiberian פתח גדול and קמץ גדול. Therefore such a great authority as רש"י, who made no distinction whatever between פתח גדול and קמץ גדול, as I pointed out in *ספר לשוננו* p. 231-256, 359-372, called פתח גדול (Ber. 13b)." Mordell, however, cites only one passage, which will be discussed later. D. Rosin in his *R. Samuel b. Meir als Schrifikerklärer* (p. 130, n. 6) also holds the same view with reference to R and Rashbam. Heidenheim, in his commentary הבנת המקרא (on Ex. 22.19), also entertains this view.

⁸⁰ These are the comments on Gen. 14.10, 29.27; Ex. 22.19; b. Ber. 13b on אָחֵד; *ibid.* 47a on אָמֵן.

a *šewa*. If the word in question, the comment observes, were in the absolute state *היה צריך להנקד בפתח השי"ן*. If this comment were genuinely R's we would be compelled to admit that R refers to a *kamez* by the term *patah*, or that in R's text the letter *ש* would be vocalized with a *patah*. This comment, however, is parenthesized even in all the current texts which not infrequently have unparenthesized insertions in the R texts. Berliner himself observes in a note that an interpreter calls the *kamez* a *patah*.

R's comment on *לאלהים* in Ex. 22.19 has led some to believe that R calls a *kamez* a *patah*.⁸¹ In this comment R makes a distinction between the vocalization of the preposition with a noun in the definite and in the indefinite state. For the vocalization of nouns with a preposition in the indefinite state R cites the forms *לעיר*, *למדבר*, *למלך*. The comment then proceeds to give the same nouns with a preposition in the definite state. With reference to the latter, R notes: *אבל כשהוא (ר"ל התיבה) נקודה פתח כמו לפלך, למדבר, לעיר נודע באיזה⁸² ומלך, באיו מדבר ובאיזה עירו מדבר, וכן לאלהים לאותן שהוזהרתם עליהם במקום אחר ... לפי שלא פירש הוצרך להנקד פתח*. This has been taken to mean that R, referring to the vowel *פ* calls it a *patah*. But this conclusion, it seems to us, is not correct. It will be noted that of the three nouns cited by way of illustrating what vowel the preposition takes in the definite and in the indefinite state, two of the nouns begin with a non-guttural letter, and the third with a guttural letter, namely, *עיר*. The guttural in this word when in the definite state, necessarily lengthens the *patah* to a *kamez*. When R speaks of a *patah* under the preposition of a noun in the definite state, he is referring to the usual vocalization of a noun in this state. He takes it for granted that in the case of a noun beginning with a guttural letter, the reader will know that the *patah* becomes a *kamez*.

We find a precisely similar comment in R on Gen. 14.10 where a distinction is drawn between *הרה*, an indefinite noun with the locative *ה* and *ההרה*, a definite noun with the locative *ה*. The comment observes: *... שה"א שבסוף התיבה עומדת במקום*.

⁸¹ Ibn Ezra, referring to the vocalization of *האלהים* notes that as a definite noun the article is vocalized with a long *kamez*. See *Sefer Zohar*, 18a

⁸² Parenthesis is in Berliner's text.

[וה"א בראשה אינה עומדת במקום למ"ד וגקורה פתח] למ"ד.⁸³ The term *pataḥ* in this passage actually refers to the vowel ־ and not to the vowel ֿ . This is evident in the citation of the form הַמְדָּקָה by way of illustrating the vocalization of a word that is analogous in form to הַקָּה , in having the locative ending and also the definite article. If the first root letter of a word begins with a guttural as in the word הָר , the vowel under the definite article which ordinarily is *pataḥ* naturally becomes a *kameṣ*. A knowledge of this on the part of the reader is assumed. Even if our interpretation is not accepted, the comment just considered cannot be cited as an instance of R's referring to a *kameṣ* as a *pataḥ*, in that there is doubt as to its being genuinely R's. We are not aware of any other comments on biblical passages, which even seemingly would justify the view that such a great authority as R "made no distinction whatever between קָמֶץ גָּדוֹל and פָּתַח ."

R's comment on אָחָד (b. Ber. 13b) has been cited as evidence that R, at times, refers to a *kameṣ* by the term *pataḥ*.⁸⁴ To the declaration that one who prolongs the pronunciation of the letter ד in the word אָחָד will have his years prolonged there follows the statement: $\text{בְּלִבְדּוֹ שְׁלֹא יִמְהַר בְּקִרְיָאָתָהּ}$. R explains this statement by saying: $\text{בְּשִׁבִּיל אֲרִיכוֹת הַדְּלִ"ת לֹא יִמְהַר בְּקִרְיָאָתָהּ שְׁלֹא יִקְרָאנָהּ בְּחֹטֵף בְּלֹא פָתַח}$.⁸⁵ The term *pataḥ* in this comment has been taken to mean that R is referring to the *kameṣ* under the letter ח . Such an explanation, it seems to us would not require the word חֹטֵף in R's comment with reference to the pronunciation of the letter ח with a *kameṣ* as there is no danger of not pronouncing the vowel under that letter. There is, however, danger

⁸³ Parenthesized in Berliner's text but not in some of the current texts. Were these words put in parenthesis in some early texts due to a misunderstanding that R in this passage is referring to a *kameṣ* as *pataḥ*?

⁸⁴ So Phineas Mordell, see above, p. 517, n. 79; see also Abraham Nissan, *ספר נסיונות* Part II, p. 17b, Wilna, 1821.

⁸⁵ Elijah Gaon would eliminate the word בְּלֹא from R's comment, thus making the comment to say, that for the sake of prolonging the sound of the letter ד in אָחָד , one should not so hurry the pronunciation of this word as to cause the vowel under the letter א to be pronounced as a חֹטֵף פָּתַח . This term could refer to a compound *segol* (see R on Joel 2.5 where the letter ע in עָרוֹךְ is said to be vocalized with a חֹטֵף פָּתַח). However, R's comment is intelligible without the suggested emendation in R's text.

of not pronouncing properly the vowel under the letter א by reason of a hurried pronunciation in order to prolong the sound of the letter ד. R's comment then means that one should not read the word אחר hurriedly, for, by so doing the letter א would be pronounced as if it were vocalized with a half vowel instead of being pronounced with a *pataḥ*, i. e. with a *segol*.⁸⁶ With regard to the phrase שלא יחטוף בחי"ת, may it not be possible that it means, not as has been suggested, namely, a hasty, incomplete or imperfect pronunciation of the vowel under the letter ח, but rather, that one should "not take hold of" or "seize" hurriedly the letter ח, and by so doing pronounce improperly or inadequately the vowel under the letter א. The verb חטף followed by the preposition ב occurs a number of times in the Targumim in the sense of "taking hold of" or "seizing hurriedly."⁸⁷

R's comment on the talmudic passage . . . אין עונין לא אמן חטופה . . . שקורין את האל"ף בחטף ולא בפתח ואומר אמן והוא צריך לומר אמן.⁸⁸ By this comment R in effect says: The א in the word אמן should not be read with a half vowel (or "hurriedly") nor with a *pataḥ*. It is necessary to pronounce the word in question אמן and not (אמן or) אמן. In this comment, as the context implies, the word אין שקורין is equivalent to שלא קורין.

Granting that the interpretations that we have offered are not acceptable, we still hold that the very few passages that

⁸⁶ Geiger believes that יחטוף in the talmudic text under consideration means that the letter ח should not be "verschluckt." But, as we pointed out, this very letter could not possibly be lightly passed over in the pronunciation of the word in question. See his *Jüdische Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaft u. Leben*, Vol. X, p. 20, 1872. Incidentally he holds that יחטף in the passage under consideration marks the beginning of the term חטף for *šewa*. So also Bacher, in "Die Anfänge d. hebräischen Grammatik," ZDMG Vol. XLIX, pp. 6, 14, 1895. Also Berliner, "Beiträge z. hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud u. Midrash" in *Jahres-Bericht d. Rabbiner-Seminars f. das orthodoxe Judenthum*, p. 29, Berlin, 1878-1879.

⁸⁷ The Hebrew word תפש which in sense partially parallels חטף is followed by the object with the preposition ב, as for instance, in Deut. 9.17; 1 Ki. 11.30; Isa. 3.6. The Targumic rendering of these passages is by the verb אחר (= אחז) and the object seized has the preposition ב even as חטף is followed by this preposition. Cf. also Targ. on Jud. 21.21 where the meaning of יחטפון is clearly to "seize" or "snatch."

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 47a.

have given the impression to some, that R at times refers to a *Ḳameṣ* by the term *Pataḥ* do not justify the view that R employs the term *Pataḥ* indifferently for the vowels פָּ and פַּ.

VARIANT INTERPRETATIONS OF R'S COMMENT ON EX. 15.18 INVOLVING VOWEL TERMS

R's comment on וְעֵד reads: לְשׁוֹן עוֹלָמוֹת הוּא וְהוּיָו בּוֹ יְסוֹד לְפִיכָךְ וְעֵד שֶׁהוּיָו בּוֹ שְׁמוֹשׁ קְמוּצָה הִיא פְּתוּחָה אֲבָל . . . וְעֵד שֶׁהוּיָו בּוֹ שְׁמוֹשׁ קְמוּצָה. This has been taken to mean that, because the letter ו in וְעֵד is a root letter, it is vowelized with a *pataḥ*, that is, this word in R's biblical text was vocalized וְעֵד; and because the letter ו in וְעֵד is a servile letter, it is vowelized with a *ḳameṣ*, that is, with the vowel פָּ.⁸⁹ The comment by Ibn Ezra on this passage is cited by way of confirming the correctness of the interpretation that R's text had the reading וְעֵד, while the letter ו in וְעֵד meaning "and a witness" is vowelized with a *ḳameṣ*. However, we do not agree with the view "That there appears to be little doubt that Rashi like Ibn Ezra had the reading וְעֵד or perhaps even וְעֵד."⁹⁰ We believe that when R speaks of the word וְעֵד meaning "forever" as being פְּתוּחָה, R is referring to the vowel פָּ under the letter ע, which vowel is sometimes called *pataḥ* by R, hence a letter so vocalized is naturally said to be פְּתוּחָה. And when R speaks of וְעֵד meaning "and a witness," being קְמוּץ, he is referring to the vowel פַּ under the letter ע, keeping in mind that the term *ḳameṣ* is one of R's terms for the vowel פַּ. The statement in the comment as to the letter ו in the one form being a servile letter and in the other form a root letter is only incidental and parenthetical and was probably made only to identify the two words in respect to the different meanings which they have.⁹¹

⁸⁹ So Heidenheim, in his commentary הבנת המקרא *ad loc.* So also the Pentateuch ed. with translation by Rosenbaum and Silberman, see note *ad. loc.*, p. 242; see also Berliner's text with note *ad. loc.*

⁹⁰ Rosenbaum and Silberman, *op. cit.*, *ibid.* This is also the view of *Minḥat Šai ad. loc.* Buxtorf's text has indeed the reading וְעֵד. As for the different views touching Ibn Ezra's comment on וְעֵד see Ibn Ezra's Short Commentary on Exodus, ed. Leopold Fleischer, p. 98, n. 2, Vienna, 1926.

⁹¹ In *Dikduke Hate'amim*, Baer-Strack, p. 64, line 5, we find the Masoretic note: בל קריה וְעֵד ע"ן פְּתוּחָה קָטָן בּוֹ מִן חֵד קְמוּץ קָטָן . . . וְעֵד.

FRAGMENT OF AN UNKNOWN MIDRASH ON DEUTERONOMY

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, Jewish Theological Seminary of America

SOME years ago,¹ I asked my friend, Professor David Maggid, of Leningrad, whether he could locate the manuscript of the *Sifre* mentioned by Hildesheimer² as being in that city, and needed by me for a critical edition of the *Sifre* on Deuteronomy. Professor Maggid could not locate the codex or find any reference to it, but generously sent me instead photographs of a manuscript of twelve leaves (twenty-six lines to the page) containing a fragment of a Yemenite Midrash on Deuteronomy (Cod. II, Firkovitch 225, part 4). The Fragment deals with the portion *Ki Tezeh*, but is incomplete, lacking not only the beginning and the end, but also a number of pages in the middle. Yet since it consists largely of citations from tannaitic sources, it is significant for a study of the sources available at the time of its composition but now lost. It is also important for a study of the nature and history of Yemenite Midrashic literature.

A. SOURCES USED BY THE MIDRASH

The Midrash is essentially a *yalkuṭ* containing excerpts from the *Sifre* and *Mekilta*³ on Deuteronomy; the Babylonian Talmud (p. 555, line 21); the Jerushalmi (p. 538, line 22); *Pesiḳta d'Rab*

¹ I am much indebted to Professor Louis Ginzberg for a number of comments on the Fragment, which I have included in the notes, marking them by brackets. Professor Alexander Marx has generously put at my disposal the manuscripts of the Midrash Ha-Gadol, Midrash Ha-Ḥefez and Nur el-Zulm of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. He also guided me through that Library's rich collection of Yemenite and other Massoretic texts in my endeavor to find a parallel for the unusual massoretic note of our fragment discussed below. Professor Ralph Marcus kindly assisted me with the translations of the Arabic fragments.

² *Beiträge Zur Geographie Palästinas*, p. VII, note 21.

³ The *Mekilta* on Deuteronomy is the midrash from the School of Rabbi

Kahana (p. 557, line 18); possibly the Midrash Tanḥumah (p. 543, line 11); the Massorah (p. 542, line 24); and the Yad of Maimonides (p. 546, line 6).

The citations from the tannaitic sources are naturally of most interest. Being like the Midrash Ha-Gadol of Yemenite origin, the present fragment cites the Sifre according to Yemenite readings. Like the Midrash Ha-Gadol, too, it weaves together with the citations from the Sifre on Deuteronomy passages from the parallel midrash of the School of Rabbi Ishmael (the so-called Mekilta) on Deuteronomy.

Before we can determine the value of the Midrash, we must ascertain, if possible, whether the compiler quotes these sources directly, or utilized other collections for them. For this purpose we must compare the work with the corresponding sections of the other available Yemenite Midrashim, the Midrash Ha-Gadol,⁴ the Midrash Ha-Ḥefez,⁵ and the Nur el-Zulm.⁶

B. RELATION OF THIS MIDRASH TO MIDRASH HA-GADOL

Most of the citations from the tannaitic midrashim on Deuteronomy occurring in this text are also found in the Midrash Ha-Gadol. But the compiler cannot have been dependent on the Midrash Ha-Gadol since he cites a number of passages, clearly emanating from the Mekilta on Deuteronomy, and yet not found in the Midrash Ha-Gadol.

Ishmael of which only scattered fragments are known. The late Professor David Hoffmann, in his *Midrash Tannaim*, collected the extant material from the published Genizah fragments and from the citations in Midrash Ha-Gadol. As will become evident below, his collection is not altogether complete, as the other Yemenite Midrashim cite passages not found in the Midrash Ha-Gadol. On the other hand, I believe that the parallel citations in the present Fragment show that Hoffmann included in the *Midrash Tannaim* much belonging neither to the Sifre nor the Mekilta, but added in a later source, utilized by the Midrash Ha-Gadol.

⁴ For this source, I utilized the convenient *Midrash Tannaim* of Hoffmann, but also the MS. of the work in the Seminary Library, Cod. Adler.

⁵ For this source, I utilized Seminary MS. Cod. Adler 275.

⁶ For this source, I utilized the MS. of the work in the Mortimer L. Schiff collection of the Seminary Library.

(I) Thus on 21.11 (p. 533, line 7) the Fragment reads: וַחֲשַׁקְתָּ בָּהּ, אַע"פ שְׁאִינָהּ יִפֶּה. This was doubtless the reading of the Mekilta, since it is found also in the Nur el-Zulm and in Midrash Ha-Ḥefez. The Midrash Ha-Gadol, on the other hand, adopts the text of the Sifre and reads: יִפֶּת תֹּאדָר, אֵין לִי אֵלָא [בספרי: יִפֶּת תֹּאדָר] מִיָּן אִפִּילוּ כַּעֲוֵרָה ת"ל וַחֲשַׁקְתָּ בָּהּ בּוֹמֵן שְׁהוּא נָאָה [בספרי: יִפֶּת תֹּאדָר] מִיָּן אִפִּילוּ כַּעֲוֵרָה ת"ל וַחֲשַׁקְתָּ בָּהּ אַע"פ שְׁאִינָהּ נָאָה.

(II) On 21.14 (p. 534, line 20) the Fragment reads: וְשַׁלַּחְתָּ לְנַפְשָׁהּ, וְלֹא לְבֵית אֱלֹהִים מִלְמַד שֶׁאֵם לֹא רָצָה לְהַתְּנִייר אַחֵר שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם מְגֻלָּל עֲלֶיהָ כָּל שָׁנִים עֶשֶׂר חֹדֶשׁ לֹא רָצָה מְקַבֶּלֶת שְׁבַע מִצּוֹת שֶׁנִּצְטָווּ בָּהֶן בְּנֵי נָח. That this passage is from the Mekilta is clear, since it is utilized by Maimonides, who says (*Hilkot Melakim* 8, 7–9):⁷ לֹא רָצָה לְהַתְּנִייר מְגֻלָּלִין עִמָּה. שָׁנִים עֶשֶׂר חֹדֶשׁ לֹא רָצָה מְקַבֶּלֶת שְׁבַע מִצּוֹת שֶׁנִּצְטָווּ בְּנֵי נָח וּמְשַׁלַּח לְנַפְשָׁהּ. . . . יִפֶּת תּוֹאֵר שֶׁלֹּא רָצָתָה לְהִנִּיחַ עֲבוּדָה זָרָה אַחֵר הַשָּׁנִים עֶשֶׂר חֹדֶשׁ הוֹרִיגִין אוֹתָהּ. The text of the passage according to Midrash Ha-Gadol is:⁸ מִלְמַד שֶׁאֵם לֹא רָצָה מְקַבֶּלֶת שְׁבַע מִצּוֹת שֶׁנִּצְטָווּ בְּנֵי נָח וְהוֹלַכְתָּ לָּהּ וְהָרִי הָיָא כְּכָל הַגֵּרִים הַחוֹשְׁבִים לֹא רָצָה לְקַבֵּל שְׁבַע מִצּוֹת אַחֵר חֲשֹׁנִים עֶשֶׂר חֹדֶשׁ הוֹרִיגִין אוֹתָהּ. This passage is found neither in the Midrash Ha-Ḥefez nor in the Nur el-Zulm.

(III) On the words וַיִּלְדוּ לוֹ בָּנִים (Deut. 21.15) the Fragment reads (p. 535, line 16): יִכּוֹל הֵבֵת תְּהֵא כַּכּוֹרָה נוֹהֶגֶת בָּהֶן ת"ל בָּנִים. This contains the sense of the parallel baraita of the Sifre and Midrash Ha-Gadol, but they read: וַיִּלְדוּ לוֹ בָּנִים, הַבָּנִים. It is clear that the Midrash Ha-Gadol in this instance followed the formulation of the law according to the Sifre, while the fragment adopted that of the Mekilta on Deuteronomy.

(IV) On Deut. 23.7 (p. 540, line 16) the Fragment records the Midrash: יִכּוֹל גֵּר עֲמוּנִי יִשְׁכֵּן עִמּוֹ בְּטוֹבָה מְכַלֵּל שְׁנֵאמַר בְּטוֹב לוֹ. In the Nur el-Zulm the passage

⁷ Karo, who naturally did not know of this tannaitic source for the norm laid down by Maimonides, expresses astonishment at the law. See *Kesef Mishneh*, ad loc.

⁸ The citation in the Midrash Ha-Gadol is for some reason derived not from the original but from Maimonides as can be seen from a study of the texts. Apparently Hoffmann perceived this and for that reason did not include the passage in the *Midrash Tannaim*.

is given more fully, and doubtless the Fragment should be emended in accordance with that text: יכול גר עמוני ישכן עמונו בטובה מכלל שנאמר בטוב לו לא תוננו יכול אף כאן ת"ל וטובתם. The awkward expression is obviously a combination of two parallel forms: יכול גר עמוני ישכן עמונו בטובה ת"ל וטובתם. מכלל שנאמר בטוב לו לא תוננו יכול אף כאן ת"ל וטובתם. But the Midrash Ha-Gadol has preserved the baraita only according to the form of the Sifre, as follows: וטובתם, למה נאמר לפי שהוא אומר עמך ישב בקרבך בטוב לו לא תוננו יכול אף עמונים ומואבים כן ת"ל וטבתם.

(V) On Deut. 25.2 (p. 551, line 18) we find the following: כדרי רשעתו, מכאן שאומדים את הנלקה which is again found verbatim in the Nur el-Zulm. The passage is clearly taken from the Mekilta on Deuteronomy, although it is omitted in Midrash Ha-Gadol.

While these passages indicate that our Fragment is not dependent on the Midrash Ha-Gadol for its citations of tannaitic sources, it may have drawn on the Midrash Ha-Gadol for other material. There are several passages which occur in identical words in our Fragment and in the Midrash Ha-Gadol, and yet cannot, in their present form, be taken from either the Sifre or the Mekilta. We must assume either that our Fragment drew on the Midrash Ha-Gadol or that both utilized some other source.

(VI) The following statement, clearly not tannaitic, but based on a discussion in the Talmud, is found in precisely the same words in both our Fragment (p. 535, line 18) and in Midrash Ha-Gadol: הבכור ולא הספק כגון שתי נשים שילדו במחבוא אחת ונתערבו מתחלה ולא הוכרו אבל אם הוכרו ולבסוף נתערבו כותבין הרשאה זה לזה ונוטלין חלק בכורה. The statement is based, as Hoffmann has noticed, on the following discussion in Baba Batra 127a. (If any doubt could exist that the statement is not tannaitic, that would be resolved by the use of the late term הרשאה, found in the Talmud, but unknown to the tannaim). דדרש רבא שתי נשים שילדו שני זכרים במחבא כותבין הרשאה זה לזה . . . בכס כך אמרו משום ר' ינאי הוכרו ולבסוף נתערבו כותבין הרשאה זה לזה לא הוכרו אין כותבין הרשאה זה לזה.

(VII) On p. 538, line 6, of our Fragment, the Mishnah of

Sanhedrin is cited, not in its original form, but as emended by Abbaye in the Talmud, Sanh. 71b. The citation occurs in the same form in the Midrash Ha-Gadol:⁹ מתרין בו בפני שנים ומלקין אותו בשלשה. The Mishnah reads: מתרין אותו בפני שלשה ומלקין אותו.

(VIII) On p. 536, line 8 of our Fragment we read: יכיר, יכירנו לאחרים מכאן אמר ר' יהודה נאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור. The same reading is found in the Midrash Ha-Gadol (See *Midrash Tannaim* p. 129, line 17), whereas the Sifre (217, ed. Friedmann, 113b, 24) reads: יכיר, יכירנו לאחרים מלמד שנאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור ר' יהודה אומר כשם שנאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור כך נאמן לומר זה בני בן חלוצה ובן גרושה היא וחכ"א אינו נאמן. The difficulty about the contradictory traditions can be easily solved by reference to *Kid.* 78b, where the *baraita* is cited as follows: יכיר, יכירנו לאחרים מכאן א"ר יהודה נאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור וכשם שנאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור כך נאמן אדם לומר זה בן גרושה וזה בן חלוצה וחכמים אומרים אינו נאמן. Here again the text common to our Fragment and the Midrash Ha-Gadol is derived neither from the Sifre nor the Mekilta but from the Talmud.

The verbal agreement of our text with that of Midrash Ha-Gadol in citing passages based on the Talmud, shows either that they had a common post-talmudic source from which they drew, or that one drew the material from the other.

The hypothesis of a common post-talmudic source is strengthened by the following considerations. In several instances, both our Fragment and Midrash Ha-Gadol contain parallel *baraitot* on the same verse, combined into a single whole, without any connective, like דבר אחר as is customary in citing parallel statements in ordinary midrashim. It is inconceivable that a compiler should have neglected to mark off the new *derashah* from the preceding by some connective. The lack can be explained most readily on the supposition that the parallel *baraita*, or comment, was originally written on the margin of some text and accidentally drawn by the scribe into the text itself. Hence several composite *baraitot* occur with verbal identity in our Fragment

⁹ The reading of Nur el-Zulm is that of the Mishnah; the reading of Midrash Ha-Hefez is simply: מתרין בו ומלקין אותו בפני שלשה.

and in Midrash Ha-Gadol, we are justified in assuming that both drew from a common source, in which these marginal annotations were interpolated into the text.

(IX) On p. 550; line 16, of our Fragment we read: **כִּי יִהְיֶה רִיב בֵּין אַנְשִׁים, לְמָה נֹאמַר לְפִי שֶׁהוּא אֹמֵר לֹא תִזְרַע כְּרֶמֶךְ כְּלָאִים (דב' כ"ט) לֹא תִלְבֵּשׁ שַׁעֲטָנִז (שם י"א) לֹא תַחְרוֹשׁ בְּשׂוֹר וּבַחֲמֵר (שם י') שׁוֹמֵעַ אֲנִי אִם זֶרַע וְחֹרֶשׁ וּלְבֹשׁ שַׁעֲטָנִז עֵבֶר עַל הַמְצוּה וְיִהְיֶה פְטוֹר ת"ל כִּי יִהְיֶה רִיב בֵּין אַנְשִׁים בֹּא הַכֶּת' וְלִימַד עַל הָעוֹבֵר בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה שִׂידָא לִקְוָה אַרְבַּעִים לִכְךָ נֹאמַר הַפֶּרֶשָׁה: [כִּי יִהְיֶה רִיב בֵּין אַנְשִׁים] בְּמַצוּה בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה הַכֶּת' מְדַבֵּר שֶׁנ' כֹּאן וְהִיא אִם בֶּן הַכּוֹת הִרְשַׁע [וְנֹאמַר לְהֵלֵךְ כִּי יִהְיֶה לְאִישׁ בֶּן סוֹרֵר וּמוֹרֵד (דב' כ"א י"ח)] הִרִי אֶתְּהָ דִן נֹא' כֹּאן בֶּן וְנֹא' לְהֵלֵךְ בֶּן מֶה בֶּן לְהֵלֵךְ בְּמַצוּה בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה הַכֶּת' מְדַבֵּר אִף כֹּאן בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה הַכֶּת' מְדַבֵּר**. The same text occurs in the Midrash Ha-Gadol (*Midrash Tannaim*, p. 162, line 11). As in our text the second *baraita*, beginning with the words **בְּמַצוּה בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה הַכֶּת' מְדַבֵּר** occurs without any introduction, and the necessary reference to Scripture must be added by emendation. The omission of even the Scriptural reference, without which the second *baraita* is meaningless, shows that originally it was written not in the text, but on the margin as a parallel to the preceding.

(X) Again on p. 533, line 9, of our Fragment we read: **לְתוֹךְ בֵּיתְךָ, וְלֹא לְבֵית אַחֵר שֶׁלֹּא יִלְחָצְנָה בְּמִלְחָמָה**. This same text occurs in the Midrash Ha-Gadol (*Midrash Tannaim* p. 127). The Sifre has only: **לְתוֹךְ בֵּיתְךָ, וְלֹא לְבֵית אַחֵר**. On the other hand the Nur el-Zulm and the Midrash Ha-Ḥefez cite merely: **שֶׁלֹּא יִלְחָצְנָה בְּמִלְחָמָה**. Clearly, in the Midrash Ha-Gadol and our Fragment two parallel *baraitot*, the one from the Sifre, the other from the Mekilta have been combined. The verbatim agreement would point to mutual dependence of our Fragment with Midrash Ha-Gadol or common dependence on some other source.

C. THE RELATION OF THE MIDRASH TO THE NUR-EL-ZULM

Our Midrash agrees verbatim with the Nur el-Zulm in the reading of a number of passages for which we know no earlier source, and which can only be of late origin, thus indicating

that it probably drew on that Midrash for this material. One example of such agreement has already been cited (see no. IV). But there are numerous others.

(XI) Thus on page 537, line 2, our Fragment cites the Mishnah Bek. 8, 1 with a number of late explanations and expansions. The passage occurs with hardly any variations also in the Nur el-Zulm, as follows: יש בכור לנחלה ואינו בכור לכהן בכור לכהן ולא לכהן בכור לנחלה ולא לכהן המפלת לאחר ארבעים יום ואחר כך נתעברה וילדה זה בכור לנחלה ואינו בכור לכהן שנ' פטר רחם וזה כבר נפטר לבטלה [נור אלצלם: נפטר רחמה]. בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה כגון שהיה לו בן מאשה אחרת ונשא אשה ועדיין לא ילדה וילדה לו בן [נור אלצלם: וילדה בן] זה בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה. [נור אלצלם מוסיף: ואע"פ שהוא פטר רחם] ובכור לנחלה ולכהן זה בכור לאביו ולאמו. ושאינו בכור לא לנחלה ולא לכהן בכור שנולד ומת ונולד אחר תחתיו אין זה בכור יש בכור לנחלה ולכהן ויש בכור לא לנחלה ולא לכהן. כיצד בכור לנחלה ולכהן זה בכור אביו ואמו, לא לזה ולא לזה שנולד לאחר נפל. לנחלה ולא לכהן זה בכור מאביו. The Midrash Ha-Gadol does not contain the passage at all.

(XII) On page 540, line 26, our Fragment reads: אמ' רבו' כשעלה סנחריב בבל כל האומות ועירבן במדי ופרס והסיר כל אומה ממקומה ולא יודע היום איזה הוא עמוני ואיזה הוא מואבי ואיזה אדומי ואיזה מצרי לפיכך כל האומות מותרין היום לבוא בקהל כשמתגיירין. The passage is remarkable because the parallel passage in the Mishnah and Tosefta do not mention מדי ופרס. Yet it occurs practically verbatim in the Nur el-Zulm: כשעלה סנחריב מלך אשור בבל כל האומות ועירבן במדי ופרס והסיר כל אומה ואומה ממקומה ועמוני ומואב אינם בארצם היום ולא יודע היום איזה הוא עמוני ואיזה הוא מואבי ואיזה אדומי ואיזה מצרי לפיכך האומות מותרין לבא בקהל כשיתגיירו וכבר עלה סנחריב ובלבל כל האומות לכך. The Midrash Ha-Gadol reads simply: כל האומ' מותרין לבוא בקהל מיד כשיתגיירו.

(XIII) On page 545, line 3, our Fragment reads: אמ' חכ' ז"ל לא ימהר אדם לגרש אשתו ראשונה אלא אם כן מצא בה ערות דבר. The passage is found verbatim in Nur el-Zulm (the only change being the substitution of 'חכ' ז"ל for 'חכמ'). It is lacking in Midrash Ha-Gadol, whereas Midrash Ha-Hefez reads: וצו חכמ' שלא יגרש אשתו ראשונה אלא אם כן מצא בה ערות דבר.

Again, while the instances are sufficient to show close kinship between our text and the Nur el-Zulm, we cannot determine with absolute certainty whether our compiler drew on that Midrash, or on some source now lost but available to both of them.

D. RELATION OF OUR MIDRASH TO MIDRASH HA-ḤEFEZ

In two passages our Fragment agrees with the citations of the Midrash Ha-Ḥefez more closely than with either of the other Midrashim. They are as follows:

(XIV) On p. 534, line 10 of the Fragment we read: 'למה אמ' ירח ימים אמ' רבו' אפ' מאמצע החדש לאמצעו אבל חדש מתחלתו ירח' החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים. The Nur el-Zulm similarly remarks: ולמה נקרא שמו ירח ולא נקרא שמו חדש שאין נקרא חדש אלא מתחלת החדש אבל מתוכו נקרא ירח. But a much closer approximation to the text of the Fragment is found in Midrash Ha-Ḥefez which reads: 'למה אמ' ירח ימים, מאמצע החדש לאמצעיתו אבל החדש מתחלתו שנ' החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים.

(XV) On the other hand it would be rash to conclude from this similarity that the author of our Fragment drew for the passage on the Midrash Ha-Ḥefez, for on p. 542, line 24, we read in our Fragment: לנכרי תשיך, למד עקום לאחוריו. אמרו הסופרים: שכך מצאו אותו בספר העזרה. וסרד... לאן סלף אל ישראלי מצות עשה אעני קרצתה ואעטא אל גוי ברבית מצות עשה פאדא טלב אל ישראלי קרצתה בגיר רבית ואל גוי ברבית פילתפת אלי אל ישראל ויעטיה בגיר רבית. The parallel passage in Midrash Ha-Ḥefez is entirely in Hebrew and reads: לנכרי תשיך, למד עקום לאחוריו שאם בא אליך הישראלי ללות: שלא ברבית שהיא מצוה והגוי ברבית שהיא מצוה פנה אל הישראלי.

(XVI) On p. 543, line 17: both our Fragment and Midrash Ha-Ḥefez read: אלו קדשי ברק הבית שנ' ויעמד עזרא על מנדל עץ אשר עשו לדבר. The verse cited is found neither in Midrash Ha-Gadol nor in Nur el-Zulm.

(XVII) On p. 554, line 3, our Fragment reads: אלא יקום בנחלה תל' יקום על שם אחיו ונא' להלן על שם אחיהם יקראו בנחלתם מה להלן בנחלה אף כאן בנחלה וכן הוא אומ' להקים שם המת על נחלתו גזרה שווה אפקא פיסוקא מפישוטיה. The Midrash Ha-Ḥefez reads: תל' יקום על שם אחיו

ונאמר להקים שם המת על (שם) נחלתו גזרה שווה אפקה פסוקה מפיטוט.

The rather awkward expression פנה אל הישראלי in the Hebrew of the Midrash Ha-Hefez (in example XV) may indicate an original Arabic, and it may therefore be that the compiler of the Midrash Ha-Hefez utilized the Midrash from which our Fragment is derived. But this cannot be decided on the basis of such slender evidence.

We may conclude, however, from what has been said, that so far as our present evidence indicates, our Fragment derives from a Midrash which was compiled by a Yemenite Jew, later than the Nur el-Zulm, but about the same time as the Midrash Ha-Hefez, or perhaps slightly before it, that is toward the end of the fourteenth century.

E. SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FRAGMENT

We have already noticed the interesting massoretic note on p. 542, line 24: למד עקום לאחוריו. In spite of diligent search I have found no record of this note outside of Yemenite sources.¹⁰ On the other hand, MS. Adler 1701, a Yemenite MS., which according to its colophon is an exact transcription of the Ben Asher codex, writes the *lamed* with an inverted stem¹¹ and remarks on the margin למד עקום. Codex Halberstamm 439, another Yemenite MS., similarly remarks: למד עקול לאחוריו. While some Yemenite codices write the *lamed* in the ordinary manner, most of them, even when they lack marginal notes, have a distorted *lamed* in the word לנכרי. This is true of the Sulzberger MS. of the Book of Deuteronomy; of Cod. Adler 366; and of Cod. Adler 451. It is interesting to note that even in

¹⁰ There is no reference to this unusual *lamed* in the printed massorah, or in any of the German, Spanish or Italian MSS. which I consulted. This includes the famous פירא of 1554. Ginzburg (Vol. II, p. 94) notes למד עקום but gives no sources.

¹¹ The normal *lamed* and the inverted *lamed* respectively appear in Cod. Adler 1701 as ל and ל; in Cod. Adler 451 as ל and ל; and in Cod. Adler 366 as ל and ל. (I owe the reproductions of these characters to the kindness of Mr. J. B. Abrahams, the Secretary of the Seminary.)

the MS. of the Midrash Ha-Gadol found in the Library of the Seminary the *lamed* is turned backward, although that Midrash contains no reference to the massoretic note.

Like other Yemenite sources our Midrash frequently uses *תנו רבנן* to introduce amoraic statements. The expression 'אמ' *למה אמ' ירה ימים, אמ':* (see text, p. 534, line 10): *רבו' אפ' מאמצע החדש לאמצעו אבל חדש מתחלתו שנ' החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים*.

The writer of our particular fragment was guilty of several omissions, especially in cases of homoioteleuton. See e. g. p. 543, line 5. He was rather uncertain of his spelling, so that he writes *כיעור* and *כיאור* in the same passage (p. 549, line 9). Again at the very beginning (p. 533, lines 10, and 13, and p. 534, line 2) he wavers between the spelling *נוה* and *גה* and *גים*.¹²

¹² In the following text, parantheses indicate material found on the margin of the MS.; brackets material which I have added as emendations.

TEXT

(כ"א י') לקיים מהם אישות ת"ל כי תצא למלחמה וראית בשביה בא הכת' ללמדך כיצד אתה עושה ואת רשאי לקיים מהם אישות: ושבית שביו, לרבות כנעניום] שבתוכה. ד"א ונתנו ה' ואלהיך] בידך ושבית שביו, משימסרו בידך את רשאי לשבותן ואם לאו אין אתה רשאי לשבותן: 5

(יא.) וראית בשביה, בשעת השביה: אשת, אע"פ שהיא אשת איש: וחשקת בה אע"פ שאינה יפה: בה ולא באחרת: ולקחת, לקוחין יסלך: לך לאשה שלא יביא שנים אחת לו ואחת לאביו או לבנו: (יב.) והבאת אל תוך ביתך, ולא לבית אחר שלא ילחצנה במלחמה: וגלחה את ראשה, שאם ראה בשערה נזה וחמדת לכך נא' 10 וגלחה את ראשה: ועשתה את צפרניה, מגדלת צפרניה כדי שתתגנה על בעלה:

(יג.) והסירה את שמלת שביה מעליה, שאם ראה בבגדים נזה וחמדה לכך נא' והסירה את שמלת שביה מעליה

1 לקיים מהם אישות, וכן במ"ת ריש פ' כי תצא, ע' 127, ושם מובאה הברייתא בשלימותה, "כי תצא למלחמה, במלחמת הרשות הכתוב מדבר, ולמה נאמר לפי שהוא אומר (דב' כ' יד) רק הנשים והטף והבהמה תבז לך אבל לא שמענו שאת רשאי לקיים מהם אישות ת"ל וכו'": 3 ושבית וכו' עד בידך, חסר בנוף הכ"י ונוסף על הגליון, וכולו נמצא בספרי ובמ"ת: 4 משימסרו וכו', מ"ת שם: 6 השביה, במ"ת ובספרי הגירסה שביה: אע"פ וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 7 אע"פ שאינה יפה, בספרי ובמ"ת ביותר ביאור, "יפת תאר, אין לי אלא בזמן שהיא נאה מנ' אפילו כעורה ת"ל וחשקת בה"; אבל בספר נור אלצלם ובמדרש החפץ הגרסה כמו שבקטע זה. 7 ולא באחרת, במ"ת, בנור אלצלם ובמדרש החפץ הגרסה, בה ולא בחברתה. 7 ולקחת וכו', עד או לבנו, מ"ת: 9 והבאת וכו' עד לכך נאמר וגלחה את ראשה, מ"ת, אלא שבכ"י, נתקן המלה נזה ע"י סופר מאוחר ונעשה גוה: שלא ילחצנה במלחמה, וכן במ"ת. לפי גרסת ר' דוד הופמאן במ"ת משמע שזו דרשה אחת עם המובא בספרי, ולא לבית אחר, ומה שנקצר בספרי מובא בשלימות במ"ת. ואין נראה לי, אלא שתי דרשות הן. האחת זו שבספרי לתוך ביתך ולא לבית אחר כלומר שאסור לו להביא אותה לבית שביה או לבית האסורים; הדרשה השניה היא שאסור לו לבא עליה במלחמה, ודורש והבאתה אל תוך ביתך ואז תבא אליה. וכן משמע מגרסת ספר נור אלצלם, "לתוך ביתך, שיכניסנה למקום פניו ואחר כן יבעול ואסור לבעול אותה ביאה שניה עד שישאנה שלא התירה תורה אלא ביאה ראשונה כנגד היצר ולא ילחצנה במלחמה שג' והבאת דרך כבוד ולא דרך בזיון". ובמדרש החפץ הגרסה, מכניסה לתוך ביתו ולא ילחצנה במלחמה. מכל זה משמע שגרסת המכילתא לדברים היתה, והבאת אל תוך ביתך, שלא ילחצנה במלחמה; וגרסת הספרי והבאת אל תוך ביתך, ולא לבית אחר; ונתאחדו שתי הדרשות במ"ת ובקטע זה. 11 מגדלת צפרניה וכו', כר"ע בספרי ובמ"ת: 12 שאם וכו' עד אחריהן, מ"ת, ושם הגרסה נזה כמו למעלה:

ויד'א והסירה את שמלת שביה מעליה מלמד שמעביר ממנה בגדים נגים ומלבישה בגדי אלמנות שהגוים אורזין הם ובנותיהם מתקשטות במלחמה בשביל להזנות אחריהן: וישבה בבית יך, בבית שחשמש בו נתקל בה ונכנס נתקל בה ויוצא דומה לקרויה ורואה אותה בנוולה: ובכתה את אביה ואת אמה, ר' אליעזר או' אביה אביה ממש אמה ממש: ר' עקיבה או' אין אביה ואמה אלא ע"ז וכו' הו' או' אומרים לעץ אבי אתה ולא בן את ילדתנו (יד' ב' כז'): ירח ימים, שלשים יום כל כך למה שתהא בת ישראל שמחה וזו בוכה שתהא בת ישראל מתקשטת וזו מתנוולת כדי שיקוץ בה: למה אמ' ירח ימים אמ' רבו' אפ' מאמצע החדש לאמצעו אבל חדש מתחלתו שנ' החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים (שמות י"ב ב'): תנו רבנן הרואה את חבירו לאחר חדש מברך שהחינו ולאחר שנים עשר חדש מברך מחיה המתים שאין המת משתכח אלא לאחר שנים עשר חדש שנ' נשכחתי כמת מלב (תה' לא י"ג) מנין האותיות שנים עשר: ואחר כך תבוא אליה ובעלתה, הא אם בעלה עד שלא עשה בה כל המעשים הללו הרי זו בעילת זנות בדא' שלא קיבלה עליה להתגייר אבל אם קבלה עליה מטבילה ומותר בה מיד: ובעלתה, אין לך בה אלא מצות בעילה: והיתה לך לאשה, כענין שנ' שארה כסותה ועונתה לא יגרע: (שמות כ"א י'):

(יד.) ושלחתה לנפשה, ולא לבית אלהיה מלמד שאם לא רצת להתגייר אחר שלשים יום מנלגל עליה כל שנים עשר חדש לא רצת מקבלת

ויד'א וכו' עד מעליה, כן יש להוסיף על פי מ"ת ועל פי הסברא; ודרשות שונות הן על הכתוב: 12 ובנותיהם, כן הגרסה גם במ"ת, ויש להניח בנותיהם. 3 בבית וכו', עד כדי שיקוץ בה, מ"ת וספרי. שחשמש, וכן הגרסה במ"ת; אמנם בספרי הגרסה שמשמש: 10 למה אמ', חסר במדרש הגדול, אבל בנור אלצלם הגרסה: ולמה נקרא שמו ירח ולא נקרא שמו חדש שאין נקרא חדש אלא מתחלת החדש אבל מתוכו נקרא ירח. וכעין זה במדרש החפץ, ולשונו מתאים יותר לזה של הקטע שלפנינו, ירח ימים, מאמצע החדש לאמצעיתו, אבל החדש מתחלתו שנ' החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים. 12 תנו רבנן וכו', ברכות נ"ח ע"ב, אמר ר' יהושע בן לוי הרואה את חבירו לאחר שלשים יום אומר ברוך שהחינו וקימנו והניענו לזמן הזה לאחר י"ב חדש אומר ברוך מחיה המתים אמר רב אין המת משתכח מן הלב אלא לאחר שנים עשר חדש שנאמר נשכחתי כמת מלב הייתי ככלי אוברד: וכך הוא גם דרכו של בעל מהג' לציין ב'תנו רבנן' מקורות מאוחרים. ומאמר זה מובא כאן גם במדרש החפץ כאן בלשון זה, תנו רבנן הרואה את חבירו לאחר שלשים יום מברך וכו'. 15 הא וכו' עד לא יגרע, מ"ת ורובו גם בספרי: 20 ולא לבית אלהיה, ספרי ומ"ת: מלמד וכו', רמב"ם ה' מלכים פ"ח ה': וכיון שטובא ברמב"ם מבורר שכן היתה הגרסה לפניו במכילתא על דברים אמנם במדרש הגדול מובא בשנוי לשון, ולא לבית אלהיה מלמד שאם לא רצת מקבלת שבע מצוות שנצטוו בני נח והולכת לה והלא [על הגליון לנכון, והרי'] היא ככל הגרים החושבים. לא רצת לקבל שבע מצוות אחר השנים עשר חדש הורגין אותה.

שבע מצות שנצטוו בהן בני נח לא רצת לקבל אחר שנים עשר חדש הורגין אותה: ומכר לא תמכרנה בכסף, אין לי אלא בכסף מנ' שלא יתנה במתנה ושלא יעשה בה טובה ת"ל ומכר לא תמכרנה: לא תתעמר בה, שלא תשתמש בה: תחת אשר עניתה, ר' יונתן או' אחר הבעילה הכת' מדבר או אינו מדבר אלא לאחר כל המעשים ת"ל ויקח אותה וישכב אותה ויעניה (ברא' ל"ד ב') נא' כאן ענוי ונא' להלן ענוי מה להלן אחר בעילה הכת' מדבר אך ענוי האמור כאן אחר בעילה הכת' מדבר: ד"א לא תתעמר בה הרי זו הוהרהר לבית דין: (טו.) כי תהיין לאיש שתי נשים וכו', וכי יש אהובה לפני המקום או שנואה לפני המקום אלא זו אהובה בנשואיה חו שנואה בנישואיה 10 והיא שאם היתה מאסורי לאוין יכול אף העריות ת"ל כי תהיין מי שיש לו בהן הוייה יצאו עריות שאין קדושין תופסין בהן. (מנ' להביא העריות ת"ל וילדו לו בנים האהובה והשנואה... להביא העריות:) יכול אפ' שפחה ונכרית ת"ל וילדו לו מי שהולדות שלו יצאו אלו שאין ולדות שלו: ר' ישמעאל אומ' בדרך ארץ הכת' מדבר שאם יהיה לו שתי נשים סופו להיות 15 אוהב אחת ושונא אחת: וילדו לו בנים, יכול הבת תהא בכורה נוהגת בהן ת"ל בנים: והיה הבן, ולא טומטום ולא אנדרגינוס: הבכור, ולא הספק כנון שתי נשים שילדו במחבואה אחת ונתערבו מתחלה ולא הוכרו אבל אם (הוכרו) ולבסוף נתערבו כותבין הרשאה זה לזה ונוטלין 20 חלק בכורה:

והורגין אותה, שם ה"ט: 2 אין לי וכו' עד שלא תשתמש בה ספרי ומ"ת: 4 ר' יונתן וכו', במ"ת, ושם מובאה גם כן דעת ר' יאשיה החולק על ר' יונתן וסובר שאף קודם הבעילה אסור להתעמר בה, כיון שעשה בה כל המעשים הללו. 8 הרי זו וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 10 וכי יש וכו' עד וזו שנואה בנישואיה, מובא גם בנור אלצלם. וכי יש וכו', קדושין ס"ח ע"א. והדרשה הראשונה היא לפי סוגית הבבלי שם, שבחייבי לאוין הכתוב מדבר, ולא בחייבי כריתות, שבהם אין קדושין תופסין. אבל לפי גרסת מ"ת וספרי, המתאימה לדרשה השניה המתחלת בכ"י שלנו מנ' להביא העריות וכו', אף בחייבי כריתות נוהג דין נחלות האמור בפרשה, ורק בולד שפחה וגויה אין נוהג. 12 מנ' וכו', המוסגר נמצא בגליון כ"י, ולכאורה חולקת ברייתא זו על המובא למעלה וסוברת שגם בחייבי כריתות ומיתות בית דין דנים דין בכור, ועיין בספרי ובמ"ת, ולקמן ע' 536 שורה 6: 13 יכול וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 15 ר' ישמעאל וכו', מ"ת וספרי: 16 יכול וכו', בספרי ובמ"ת הגרסה, וילדו לו בנים הבנים בתורה הווא ואין הבנות בתורה הזאת: 17 ולא טומטום וכו' עד ולא הספק, ספרי ומ"ת: 18 כנון שתי נשים וכו' עד ונוטלין חלק בכורה, מובא גם במ"ת ואולי הוא ממכילתא לדברים, אמנם עיין בב"ב קכ"ז ע"א ובבכורות מ"ז ע"א. ושם מוכח שלא היה לפני ר' ינאי מקור תנאי בזה, ועוד מעירנו מורי ר' לוי גינצבורג שהמלה הרשאה המובאה במאמר זה אינה נמצאת במובן זה בספרות התנאים. ולכן נראה שלפני בעל מה"ג ובעל קטע שלנו כבר היה מונח מקור שבו נוסף אל המכילתא לדברים מאמר זה ושיסודו בסוגיות הבבלי האמורות:

(טז.) והיה ביום הנחילו, ביום מפילין נחלות ואין מפילין נחלות] בלילה: הנחילו את בניו מ' אתה או' שאין ראייה לדבר זכר לדבר והתנחלתם אותם לבניכם אחרים (ויק' כ"ה מ"ו): את אשר יהיה לו, מלמד שהבן נוטל בראוי כבמוחזק: (היה הבכור ממזר נוטל פי שנים שנ' כי את הבכור בן השנואה יכיר זו ששנואה בנשואיה ואין צריך לומר בן גרושה או בן חלוצה):

(יז.) כי את הבכור בן השנואה יכיר, יכירנו לאחרים מכאן אמ' ר' יהודה נאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור ואפלו היו מוחזקין בזה שהוא בכור ואמ' אביו על אחר שהוא בכור נאמן: דא' יכיר אמ' מר בכור שנוולד לאחר מיתת אביו אינו נוטל פי שנים מאי טעמא יכיר אמ' רחמנא והא ליתיה דיכיר: בכל אשר ימצא לו, מלמד שאין הבכור נוטל בראוי כבמוחזק: בכל אשר ימצא לו, מלמד שאינו נוטל פי שנים

1 ביום וכו' עד בלילה, ספרי ומ"ת: 2 מנ' אתה או' וכו', במ"ת מובא בשלימותו, מנין אתה אומר שאין אדם רשאי ליתן את נכסיו בחייו עד שעה שהוא מת אעפ"י שאין ראייה לדבר וכו': 4 מלמד וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 5 היה וכו', במ"ת, המוסגר חסר בנוף הכ"י ונוסף על הגליון: ועיין למעלה ע' 535 שורה 12: 8 יכירנו לאחרים וכו' עד זה בני בכור, עיין קדושין ע"ד ע"א, ב"ב ככ"ז ע"ב, וספרי ומ"ת. גרסת הספרי היא יכיר, יכירנו לאחרים מלמד שנאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור. ר' יהודה אומר כשם שנאמן אדם לומר [זה] בני בכור כך נאמן לומר זה בני בן חלוצה וכן גרושה הוא וחכמים אומרים אין נאמן. לפי גרסה זו הכל מודים שנאמן האב לומר זה בני בכור, ורק אם נאמן לפסול חולקים על ר' יהודה. וכן משמע במשנה ב"ב פ"ח מ"ח, שנאמר שם סתם, האומר זה בני נאמן; ונראה שאין בזה מחלוקת, וכשם שנאמן לומר זה בני, כך נאמן לומר זה בני בכור. והמחלוקת רק אם נאמן לומר בן חלוצה הוא. וכן מפורש ע"י ר' אבהו בשם ר' יוחנן בירושלמי קדושין פ"ד ה"ז (ס"ו ע"ב), תמן תנינן האומר זה בני נאמן. ר' אבהו בשם ר' יוחנן לתת לו אבל לא ליקח ממנו, ואעפ"י שמצדד שם לומר שמאמר ר' אבהו לאו ארישא איתמר אלא אסיפא איתמר, נראה ברור שבתחלתו ארישא איתמר. ועיין עוד בתוספתא קדושין פ"ה ה"ה (ע' 342), ובשנויי גרסאות. ואולי הגרסה הנכונה היא, ר' יוס' והוא מכריע בין ר' יהודה לחכמים. ובין כך ובין כך אין ספק שכיון שחולקים אם נאמן לפסול, שהכל שוים שנאמן לזכות את בנו. מן האמור מבורר שגרסת הברייתא בספרי עיקרית, ובבבלי נשתבש, יכיר יכירנו לאחרים מכאן א"ר יהודה נאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור וכשם שנאמן לומר זה בני בכור כך נאמן אדם לומר זה בן גרושה וזה בן חלוצה וחכ"א אינו נאמן; כאילו חולקים חביריו על ר' יהודה גם בהאמנת האב באמרו, זה בני בכור; במ"ת ובקטע שלפנינו נשתבשה הברייתא עוד בחסרון סופה, על פי גרסת הבבלי, יכירנו לאחרים מכאן א"ר יהודה נאמן אדם לומר זה בני בכור. 9 ואפלו וכו', עיין ב"ב שם, ת"ר היו מוחזקין בו שהוא בכור ואמר אביו על אחר שהוא בכור נאמן, ואין אלו מדברי ר' יהודה שאינם נזכרים לא בספרי ולא במ"ת ולא במשנה. 10 אמ' מר וכו', ב"ב קמ"ב ע"ב: 12 מלמד וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 13 מלמד וכו', ב"ב קכ"ד ע"ב:

בשבח ששבחו נכסים לאחר מיתת אביו: כי הוא ראשית אונו, אונו של איש ולא אונו של אשה: יש בכור לנחלה ואינו בכור לכהן בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה ולכהן בכור לא לנחלה ולא לכהן בכור לנחלה ולא לכהן המפלת לאחר ארבעים יום ואחר כך נתעברה וילדה זה בכור לנחלה ואינו בכור לכהן שנ' פטר רחם (שמות י"ג כ') וזה כבר נפטר לבטלה: בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה כגון שהיה לו בן מאשה אחרת ונשא אשה ועדיין לא ילדה וילדה לו בן זה בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה ובכור לנחלה ולכהן זה בכור לאביו ולאמו ושאינו בכור לא לנחלה ולא לכהן בכור שנולד ומת ונולד אחר תחתיו אין זה בכור: לו משפט ה בכור, מגיד שאדם יורש בכורת אביו: ד"א מלמד שהבכורה יוצאה בדינין:

(יח.) כי יהיה לאיש בן סורר ומורה, [סופו להיות בנו סורר ומורה על שנשא אשה שאינה הוגנת לו: תנו רבנן [עבי]רה גוררת עבירה ומצוה [גורר]ת מצוה עבירה גוררת עבירה למדנו אותו מדרשינן [ס]מוכים לפי מי שנשא יפת תואר סופו שיהיה לו שתי נשים אחת [אהובה] ואחת שנואה: וסופו שיהיה לו בן סורר ומורה וסופו להיות בו כי יהיה באיש חטא משפט מות וכו', ומצוה גוררת מצוה שהרי מי ששלח את האם ולוקח הבנים סופו שיהיה לו בית חדש וכרם ושוור וחמור וט[לי]ת מצויצת ואשה: כי יהיה לאיש בן, בן לאיש ולא בן לבן דאמ' רב הסדא קטן שהוליד אין בנו נעשה בן סורר ומורה שנ' כי יהיה לאיש בן לאיש ולא בן לבן: בן, ולא בת; בן, ולא איש; בן ולא קטן מכאן אמר רב שבתאי כל ימיו של בן סורר ומורה אינו אלא שלשה חדשים בלבד והאן אנן תנן מאימתי נעשה בן סורר ומורה משיביא שתי שערות ועד

1 אונו וכו' עד אשה, ספרי ומ'ת: יש בכור וכו' עד בכור לנחלה ולא לכהן, עיין משנה בכורות ריש פ"ח. כל המאמר עד אין זה בכור, מובא בנור אלצלם בשנים אלו: תחת לבטלה כתוב רחמה; תחת המלים וילדה לו בן, כתוב וילדה בן; אחר המלים זה בכור לכהן ואינו בכור לנחלה מסיף, ואע"פ שהוא פטר רחם. אמנם במדרש החפץ הנרסה, יש בכור לנחלה ולכהן ויש בכור לא לנחלה ולא לכהן לכהן ולא לנחלה לכהן ולא לכהן כיצד בכור לנחלה ולכהן זה בכור אביו ואמו, לא לזה ולא לזה שנולד אחר נפל, לנחלה ולא לכהן זה בכור מאביו, לכהן ולא לנחלה זה בכור לאמו, ועיין במ'ת: 3 הספלת וכו', עיין במגרא שם מ' ע"ב: 10 מגיד וכו', וכן מבואר במ'ת ובחוספתא ב"ב פ"ו ה"ז (ע' 408): 10 מלמד וכו', ספרי ומ'ת: 12 סופו וכו', כעין זה במ'ת, ועיין בספרי ובבלי קדושין ע' ע"א; וסנהדרין ק"ז ע"א: 13 עבירה גוררת עבירה וכו', עיין מ'ת סוף ע' 131, בדברי ר"ע, ובספרי פ' ר"ח: ונוסח המלוקט מסכים יותר לזה של התנחומא כי תצא סי' א', ואין ספק שלפניו היה נוסח אחר מהתנחומא. 19 דאמ' רבא חסד' וכו' סנהדרין ס"ח ע"ב: 21 ולא בת, ספרי ומ'ת: ולא איש, ספרי ומ'ת: ולא קטן וכו', עיין ספרי ומ'ת, וסנהדרין ס"ט ע"א: 23 והא אנן תנן וכו', סנהדרין שם [המלוקט לא העתיק דברי הנמרא עצמם אלא השתמש בהם, ושינה סנונים לצרכו]

עמהם כשרים שלא לפרסם לחטאים ואתיא כההיא דאמ' ר' לוי בשם ריש לקיש
במקום אשר תשחט העולה תשחט החטאת (ויק' ו' י"ח)
שלא לפרסם החטאים: שלשה ממזרים הם ממזר ודאי וממזר ספק וממזר
מדבריהם ממזר ודאי זה שבא מערוה מן העריות הודאיות וממזר ספק הבא
5 מספק ערוה כגון אשת איש שנתגרשה ספק גרושין ובא עליה אחד והוליד ממנה
הולד ספק ממזר וממזר מדבריהם האשה ששמעה שמת בעלה ונשאת והרי
בעלה קיים ובא עליה והיא תחת השני הרי הבן ממזר (מדברין) סופרים: ממזר
ודאי אסרה תורה ולא ממזר ספק

10
(כ"ד.) אשר לא קדמו אתכם בלחם ובמים אמרת
מי (דרכו לקדם) האנשים (נאו הנשים) דברי ר' ישמעאל ר' עקיבא או' עמוני
ולא עמונית מואבי ולא מואבית: תנן התם עמוני ומואבי אסורין ואיסורם
איסור עולם אבל נקבותיהן מותרין מיד: בקהל ה' (אינו בא) בא הוא
15 במינו ובקהל גרים:

(ה.) על דבר אשר לא קדמו [אתכם בלחם]
ובמים, וכי לחם הם צריכין והלא המן והשלו יורדין להם ארבעים
שנה אלא דרך ארץ שהבא מן הדרך מקדימין לו בלחם ומים: למה נא' על
דבר ולא נאמ' על אשר אלא רמו לעצה בלעם בלבק לכך נא'
20 על דבר: תנו רבנן גדולה מלוגמה שמקרב את הרחוקים ומרחקת את
הקרובים ומעלמת עינים מרשעים ומשרה שכינה על נביאי השקר ושגתה עולה
ודון מרחקת קרובים מעמון ומואב מקרבת רחוקים] מיתרו מעלמת עינים

8 שלשה וכו', רמב"ם אסורי ביאה ט"ו י' וזה לשונו: 'שלשה ממזרים הם ממזר
ודאי וממזר ספק וממזר מדבר' סופרים איזהו ממזר ודאי זה שבא מן הערוה הודאית
כמו שבארנו; וממזר ספק זה שבא מספק ערוה כגון בא על האשה שנתקדשה ספק
קדושין או נתגרשה ספק גרושין וכיוצא בהן; מדברי סופרים כגון אשה ששמעה שמת
בעלה ונשאת והרי בעלה קיים ובא בעלה הראשון עליה והיא תחת השני הרי הבן ממזר
מדברי סופרים; וכעין זה נמצא גם במדרש החפץ ונוסחו יותר קרוב לנוסח הרמב"ם
מזה של הקטע. ממזר ודאי וכו' קדושין ע"ג ע"א; רמב"ם אסורי ביאה ט"ו כ"א:
11 אשר לא, שתי שורות שלפני מלים אלו הן בראש עמוד ואי אפשר לקרותן
ואולי יש להשלימן מן המובא במ"ה, "לא יבא עמוני ומואבי, בזכרים הכתוב
מדבר אתה אומר בזכרים הכתוב מדבר או אחד זכרים ואחד נקבות במשמע ת"ל על
דבר אשר לא קדמו וכו'" ועיין בספרי וביבמות ע"ז ע"א: 12 תנן התם
וכו', יבמות פ"ח מ"ג: 14 בקהל ה' וכו', מ"ת; ושם באריכות כמו למעלה, בקהל
ה' אינו בא בא הוא במינו; בקהל ה' אינו בא בא הוא בקהל גרים: 17 וכי לחם וכו',
כעין זה במ"ה; אבל שם בסגנון אחר: 20 תנו רבנן וכו', מטהרין ק"ג ע"ב בשם
ר' יוחנן וכן מובא במדרש החפץ, מכאן אמרו גדולה מלוגמה וכו', ועל פי
הגרסה שם השלמתי פה מלוגמה; ובנוסחי הדפוס של הגמרא הגירסה גדולה
לגיטה:

מרשעים ממכה שפתו היתה מצויה לעוברי דרכים ומשרה שכניה על נביאי
הנשקר] מחבירו של עדו..... גם אני נביא כמוך ומלאך
דבר אלי [בדבר ה'] לאמר; [ויהי הם] יושבים על
השלחן ויהי דבר ה' אל הנביא [אשר] הושיבו
(מ"א י"ג י"ט) שגנתו עולה זדון מונתן בן שאול דאמ' ר' יהודה אלמלי הלוהו
5 יונתן לדוד שתי ככרות לא נחרבה נוב עיר הכהנים ולא נטרד דואג האדומי
ולא נהרג שאול [והמלך] ושלשת בניו:

(ו.) ויהפך יי אלהי' לך את הקללה לברכה,
שהיה [חושב] והמקום הופכה בפיו לברכה: למה לא נא' ויהפך יי
לך את הקללות אלא ללמדך שכל קללות בלעם חזרו על ישראל
10 כשחטאו חוץ מבתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות לכך נא' את הקללה
לברכה:

(ז.) לא תדרש שלומם, למה נא' לפי שנאמר] כי תקרב
אל עיר להלחם עליה וקראת אליה לשלום [דב'
כ' י'] שומיע אני אף עמון ומואב ת"ל לא תדרש שלומם וטובתם
15 יכול גר עמוני ישכן עמנו בטובה מכלל שנ' בטוב לו לא תוננו
ת"ל וטובתם: כל ימיך לעולם, עד סוף כל הדורות:

(ח.) לא תתעב אדומי כי אחיך, אחד זכרים ואחד
נקיבות: ר' יהודה בן גמליאל או' שתי אומות אחת קדמה את ישראל בחרב
20 והם אדום לפי שנ' פן בחרב אצא לקראתך (במדבר ב' י"ח)
מה הקב"ה או' לו לא תתעב אדומי, ואחת קדמה ישראל בעבירה
אלו מואב שנ' וישב ישראל בשטים (שם כ"ה א') מה הקב"ה
או' להן לא יבא עמו' מואב' נמצאת אומ' המחטיא את חבריו
בדבר עבירה קשה [ומי שהוא הורגו]:

(ט.) בניס אשר יולדו, לרבות את הבנות כדברי חכ': ולא
25 תתעב מצרי כי גר היית בארצו אמ' רבו' כשעלה סנחריב
בלבל כל האומות ועירבן במדי ופרס והסיר כל אומה ממקומה: ולא יודע

1 שפתו היתה מצויה וכו', סנהדרין שם ק"ג סוף ע"ב: 5 דאמר
רב יהודה וכו', שם ק"ד ע"א: 9 שהיה חושב וכו', מ"ת: 12 לברכה,
כאן יש הערה על הגליון אבל אי אפשר לקרותה: 13 למה נאמר וכו', עד ת"ל
וטובתם, ספרי ומ"ת: 16 יכול גר עמוני וכו', הנהתי הלשון המקוצר
כאן על פי המובא בגור אלצלם. ובמאמר זה נתאחדו שני סגנונים של דרשה אחת, הראשונה
"יכול גר עמוני ישכן עמנו בטובה ת"ל וטובתם"; השנייה, והיא נמצאת בספרי
ובמ"ת "מכלל שנ' בטוב לו לא תוננו יכול אף כאן ת"ל וטובתם".
17 עד סוף כל הדורות, מ"ת: 18 אחד וכו', עד נקיבות, מ"ת:
19 ר' יהודה בן גמליאל וכו' עד שהוא הורגו, מ"ת: לרבות
עד חכמים, מ"ת: ובספרי בסגנון אחר: 26 אמ' רבו' וכו' עד
כשמתגלגלים. עיין ידים פ"ד מ"ד ותוספתא קדושין פ"ה ה"ד ע' 342. והמאמר מובא
בשניים קלים גם בגור אלצלם וזה נוסחו שם, כשעלה סנחריב מלך אשור בבלבל כל

היום איזה הוא עמוני ואיזה הוא מואבי ואיזה אדומי ואיזה מצרי לפיכך כל האומות מותרין היום לבוא בקהל כשמתגיידין.

(י.) כי תצא מחנה על אויביך, במלחמת חובה הכת'

מדבר: ונשמרת מכל דבר רע, אמ' ר' יוסי ואם אינו [יוצא] אינו

נשמר אלא מכאן שאין השטן מקטרג אלא בשעת סכנה: ונשמרת מכל

דבר רע, שלא ירהר אדם ביום ויבוא לידי טומאה בלילה שנ'

כי יהיה בך איש אשר לא יהיה טהור מקרה לילה:

(יא.) כי יהיה בך איש אשר לא יהיה טהור, בך קרי

נוהג אינו נוהג באחרים: איש, פרט לקטן: מקרה לילה, קרה

יומם מנ' תל' אשר לא יהיה טהור מכל מקום אם כן למה נאמ'

מקרה לילה דבר הכת' בהווה: ויצא אל מחוץ למחנה, זה

מחנה שכניה: לא יבא אל תוך המחנה, זו מחנה לוי' שהרי היה

לו לומר לא יבא אל תוכה אם הוא מחנה שכניה: וכבא השמש יבא אל

תוך המחנה, מלמד שביאת שמשו מעכבת ליכנס לפנים מן הנמחנה:

(יג.) ויד תהיה לך מחוץ למחנה, אין יד אלא מקום

שנ' והנה מציב לו יד (ש"א ט"ז י"ב): ויצאת שמה חוץ,

ולא בעמידה: ויצאת שמה חוץ, להטיל מים:

(יד.) ויתד תהיה לך וכו' הרי להסך רגליו: ויתד תה'

לך על אז', אין אזניך אלא מקום זיוג: וחפרת בה, אין נפנין

לא למורח ולא למערב אלא בין צפון לדרום: דרש בן קפרא ויתד

תה' לך על אז' אל תקרא אֲזִינָה אלא אֲזִינָה שאם ישמע אדם דבר

מנונה יניח יתד [ב]אזניו: והיה מחניך קדוש, מכאן שאין קורין

האומות ועירבן במדי ופרס והסיר כל אומה ואומה ממקומה ועמון ומואב אינם

בארצם היום ולא יודע היום עמוני ואיזה הוא מואבי ואיזה הוא אדומי ואיזה הוא

מצרי לפיכך האומות מותרין לבא בקהל כשיתגיידין. והעירני מורי ר' לוי גינצבורג שאין

נמצא בשום מקום אחר שנתערבו הגוים במדי ופרס, אדרבה במשנה ותוספתא נאמר

שנתערבו זה בזה. והלשון ולא יודע היום הוא מאוחר, ואולי נתרנם המאמר

ממקור ערבי, אמנם במדרש חפץ הנרסה, וכבר עלה סנחריב ובלבל כל האומות

לכך כל האומות מותרין לבוא בקהל מיד כשיתגיידין.³ במלחמת חובה

וכו', עד בשעת סכנה, מ"ת: ⁶ שלא ירהר וכו', ספרי ומ"ת:

⁸ בך קרי וכו' עד דבר הכתוב בהווה, מ"ת: וכעין זה גם בספרי:

¹¹ זה מחנה שכניה וכו', מ"ת, נור אלצלם, ומדרש החפץ אמנם בספרי מובא

בשם רש' החימיני להיפך, ויצא אל מחוץ למחנה זה מחנה לוי', לא יבא אל תוך המחנה

זה מחנה שכניה.¹⁴ מלמד וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: ¹⁵ אין יד וכו', ספרי ומ"ת:

¹⁷ ולא בעמידה, שם. להטיל מים וכו' עד להסך רגליו, מ"ת:

¹⁹ אין אזניך וכו', עד זיוגך, ספרי ומ"ת: ¹⁹ אין נפנין עד לדרום,

מ"ת: ²⁰ דרש וכו' עד באזניו, כתובות ה' ע"א וכן מובא במה"ג כאן. אֲזִינָה =

אֲזִינָה, כן נקוד בכ"י: ²² מכאן וכו', עיין בספרי ובמ"ת: ושם הורסו, מכאן אמרו

לא יקרא אדם קרית שמע בצד משרה של כובסים ולא יכנס לא למרחץ ולא לבורסקי

וספרים וחפילין בידו:

קרית שמע ותפלה אלא במקום קדוש שהרי הו' או' כי יי אלהי' מתהלך בקרב מחניך:

(טו.) ושב מאחריך, שלא יתן אדם אחוריו כנגד בית קדש הקדשים שנ' הגיד לך אדם מה טוב והצ' לכת עם אלהי', (מיכה ו' ה') מכאן היה ר' פנחס בן יאיר או' זריות מביאה לידי נקיות נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה טהרה מביאה קדושה קדושה מביאה לידי ענוה ענוה מביאה לידי יראת חטא יראת חטא מביאה לידי חסידות חסידות מביאה לידי רוח הקדש רוח הקדש מביאה לידי תחיית המתים תחיית המתים מביאה לידי אליהו ז"ל זריות מביאה לידי נקיות וכלה מכפר (ויקרא ט"ז כ') נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה וכפר עליו הכהן וטהר (ויק' י"ד כ"א) טהרה לידי קדושה וטהרו וקדשו (שם ט"ו י"ט) קדושה לידי ענוה כי כה אמ' רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו וכו' (ישע' נ"ז ט"ו) ענוה לידי יראת חטא עקב ענוה יראת יי (משלי כ"ד) יראת חטא לידי חסידות שמרה נפשי כי חסיד אני (תהלים פ"ו ב') חסידות לידי רוח הקדש אז דברת בחזון לחסידריך (שם פ"ט כ') רוח הקדש לידי תחיית המתים ונתתי בכם רוח וחיייתם (יחז' ל"ו י"ב) תחיית המתים לידי אליהו ז"ל שנ' הנה אנכי שולח לכם (מלאכי ג' כ"ג):

(כ') ורבן גמליאל היה אומר ולאחיך לא תשיך והלא כבר נא' לא תשיך לאחיך אלא יש רבית מוקדמת ויש רבית מאוחרת ורבית בשעת מלוה הא כיצד מכבדו על שלא לוה ממנו שיש בלבו ללוות ממנו מכבדו משלוה ממנו עד שלוה ממנו ומכבדו בשעת מלוה נמצאת אומ' רבית מוקדמת ורבית מאוחרת ורבית בשעת מלוה: (כא.) לנכרי תשיך, למד עקום לאחוריו אמרו הסופרים שכך

3 שלא יתן וכו' עד הנה אנכי שולח לכם, מ"ת ושם מובא המאמר שלא יתן וכו' בשם ר' נתן: 4 והצנע וכו', ובסגנון הקצר הזה מובא הכתוב גם כמ"ת: 10 וכפר עליו, ובמ"ת הובא הכתוב הנוכח וכפר עליה הכהן וטהרה (ויק' י"ב ה'): 18 שולח לכם, כאן חסרים איזו דפים: 19 רבן גמליאל וכו', השלמתי המאמר בתחילתו על פי המובא במ"ת; וכל המאמר מובא שם עם נמצאת אומ' וכו' ורבית בשעת מה: 24 למד עקום לאחוריו, כן הוא לכאורה מסורת התימנים, ומובא במדרש החפץ. וגם בטופס של מדרש הגדול שלפני הלמ"ד של לנכרי עקום, אעפ"י שהמאמר אינו מובא שם, עיינתי בהרבה כ"י של דברים בספרית הסימנר, ומצאתי שברוב ספרי התימנים עקום הלמ"ד, ובאחרים יש גם מסורה על הגליון למ"ד עקום; בכ"י אחד מצאתי, למ"ד עקול לאחוריו; אמנם במסורה הנדפסת, ובכ"י האטליינים, והגרמנים, והספרדים שעיינתי בהם, וביניהם ההעתק פירא של שנת 1564, לא מצאתי מסורה זו, והשווה הערתי למעלה במבוא.

מצאו אותו בספר העזרה: וסרד לאן סלף אל ישראלי מצות עשה אעני
 קרצתה ואעטא אל גר ברבית מצות עשה פאדא טלב אל ישראלי קרצא בגיר
 רבית ואל גוי ברבית פילתפת אלי אל ישראלי ויעטיה בגיר רבית:
 (כב.) כי תדור נדר נא' כאן נדר ונאמ' להלן נדר מה להלן
 נדר ונדבה (אף כאן נדר ונדבה) מכן שחייבין על הנדבה בבל תאחר: לא
 תאחר לשלמו מג' שאינו חייב על בל תאחר עד שיעברו עליו שלשה
 רגלים לפי שנ' כאן לא תאחר לשלמו כי דרש ידרשנו
 ונא' להלן ארץ אשר יי' אלהיך דורש אותה מראשית
 השנה ועד אחרית שנה (דב' י"א כ"ב) מה דרישה האמורה להלן
 לאחר שנה אף כאן לאחר שנה: כי דרש ידרשנו, שתי דרישות
 דורשו ודורש עונות אחרים עמו: אמ' ר' הונא מעשה באחד שנדר ולא שילם
 נדרו ויצא לפרוש בים וטבעה ספינתו ומת: (כג.) וכי תחדל לנדר,
 אמ' ר' יהודה טוב אשר לא תדר משתדור ולא תשלם:
 (כד.) מוצא שפתיך תשמר, זו מצות עשה. ועשית כאשר
 נדרת, זה נדר: ליי' אלהי', אלו חטאות ואשמות עולות ושלמים
 שנ' חטאת ליי' אשם ליי' עולה ליי': נדבה, כמשמעה:
 אשר דברת, אלו קדשי בדק הבית שנ' ויעמד עזרא על
 מגדל עץ אשר עשו לדבר (נחמ' ה' ד'): בפיק, זו צדקה
 שנ' יצא מפי צדקה (ישעיה מ"ח כ"ג): כאשר נדרת ליי'
 אלהיך נדבה, אם כמה שנדרת עשית זהו נדר ואם לאו נדבה מכאן
 אמ' כל הזבחים שנובחו שלא לשמן כשרים אלא שלא עלו לבעלים לשם חובה:
 אשר דברת בפיק, עד שיהיה פיו ולבו שווין:

1 וסרד וכו', השורה הראשונה של המשפט הערבי נתשטטה ואי אפשר
 לקרותה: המש פטהשני מן אעני והלאה יש לתרגם ככה: זאת אומרת מלוה הנתונה
 לגוי ברבית מצות עשה, ואם הישראל מבקש מלוה בלא רבית, והגוי ברבית יחון
 את הישראל ויתנו לו שלא ברבית. במדרש החפץ מובא המאמר בסגנון עברי וז'ל
 .לנכרי תשיך למד עקום לאחוריו שאם בא אליך הישראלי ללות שלא ברבית שהיא
 מצוה והגוי ברבית שהיא מצוה פנה אל הישראלי.⁴ כי תדור וכו' עד אף כאן
 נדר ונדבה, ספרי ומ'ת: ⁵ אף כאן, המוסגר חסר בכ"י ונשלם על הגליון:
 [מכן שחייבין, כמ'ת מובאין דברי הרמב"ם בזה; ומחברנו השתמש במקור שאינו
 ידוע לנו] ⁶ עד שיעברו עליו וכו', ספרי דברים פ' ס': מ'ת כאן:
 10 שתי דרישות וכו', מ'ת: ¹¹ אמ' ר' הונא וכו', תנחומא וישלח סוף סי'
 ח', והשוה ירו' פ"א ה"א (ל' ע"ד): ¹³ א"ר יהודה וכו', ספרי ומ'ת: ¹⁴ זו
 מצות עשה וכו', ספרי, מ'ת ומדרש החפץ: ר"ה ו' ע"א, ירו' ר"ה נ"ו ע"ג:
 עשה, בספרי ובמ'ת, תשמר זו מצות לא תעשה: ¹⁵ אלו חטאות וכו',
 מ'ת: ר"ה שם: ¹⁶ שנ' חטאת וכו', במדרש החפץ הגרסה רק שנאמר חטאת
 לה', עולה לה', ¹⁷ שנ' ויעמד וכו', וכן מובא הכתוב הזה במדרש החפץ.
 19 שנ' יצא מפי וכו', מדרש החפץ וכן מפורש גם בתוס' ר"ה שם ד"ה בפיק:
 20 אם כמה וכו' עד לשם חובה, מ'ת: ²² עד וכו', מ'ת:

(כה.) כי תבוא בכרם רעך, בפועל הכתוב מדבר נאן אינו מדבר אלא בכל אדם וכשהוא אומר] לא תגזל (ויקרא י"ט י"ג) הרי כל אדם אמורין הא מה ת"ל כי תבא בכרם רעך בפועל הכת' מדבר ובשעת מלאכה: ד"א נא' כאן כי תבא ונא' להלן ולא תבוא עליו השמש (דב' כ"ד ט"ו) מה להלן בפועל אף כאן בפועל: רעך, פרט לאחרים; רעך, פרט לגבוה; ואכלת, ולא מוצץ: ענבים, ולא ענבים ודבר אחר: כנפשך, כך נפשו של פועל מה נפשך אתה אוכל ופטור אף פועל אוכל ופטור: שבעך, ולא אכילה גסה: ואל כל יך לא תתן, בזמן שאתה נותן לכליו של בעל הבית אתה אוכל ובזמן שאין אתה נותן לכליו אין אתה אוכל ואדא' כאן אלשי בתלוש מן הקרקע פלה אז יאכל פי וקת כדמתה שנ' לא תחסם שור בדישו ולא נא' לא תדוש בחסום אדא' בדאלך אן לא חסימה בוגה לא לשור ולא לאדם:

(כו.) כי תבא בקמת רעך, בפועל הכת' מדבר כמו שפירשנו לעיל: וקטפת מלילות, יכול לעולם ת"ל וחרמש לא תניף וכו', בשעה שאתה מניף על קמת בעל הבית: רעך, פרט לאחרים ולגבוה. ולמדנו משני כתובים שהשכיר אוכל במחובר בשעת גמר מלאכה: וקטפת מלילות, וקטפת ענבים, מכאן למדנו שבמחובר הכת' מדבר ואלו לא באו שני כתובים הללו לא שמעינן:

(כ"ד א'). כי יקח איש אשה ובעלה, למה נא' לפי שהוא או' ואיש אשר ינאף את אשת איש (ויק' כ' י') לא שמענו אלא בזמן שיש שלום ביניהם כל הבא עליה יהא במיתה (ואבל אם אין שלום ביניהם לא שמענו ת"ל כי יקח איש אשה ובע' בא הכתוב ללמד על אשת איש לעולם כל הבא עליה יהא במיתה] עד שתצא ממנו בגט: כי יקח איש אשה ונא' כסף השדה קח ממני (ברא' כ"ג י"ג) מכאן שהאשה מתקדשת בכסף: ובעלה, מכאן שמתקדשת בביאה:

1 בפועל וכו', מ"ת, והוספתי את המוסגר על פי הגרסה שם: 4 ובשעת מלאכה, עיין במ"ת: 4 ד"א וכו' עד אף כאן בפועל, מ"ת: 6 פרט לאחרים וכו' עד ולא מוצץ ספרי ומ"ת: 7 ולא ענבים ודבר אחר, מ"ת: 8 כנפשך וכו' עד אכילה גסה, מ"ת: 9 בזמן וכו' עד אין אתה אוכל, מ"ת: 10 ואדא' וכו', חרגמו ואם יש שום דבר בתלוש מן הקרקע הרי הוא לו; ודאי מותר לאכלו בזמן עבודתו שנא' לא תחסום שור בדישו, ולא נאמר לא תדוש בחסום רצונו בזה שחסימה בפנים אסורה בין לשור בין לאדם: 14 בפועל וכו', עיין מ"ת: 15 יכול וכו' עד ולגבוה, ספרי ומ"ת: 17 ולמדנו וכו', עיי' ב"מ פ"ט ע"א: 20 למה נאמר וכו' עד ממנו בגט, מ"ת, והשלמתי משם מה שנשמט מכ"י על פי דמיון המלים: 26 מכאן וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 26 מכאן וכו', ספרי ומ"ת:

ומנ' אף [בשטר] ת"ל ויצאה והיתה מקיש הוייה ליציאה מה יציאה
 בשטר אף הוייה בשטר: והיה אם לא תמצא חן בעי' וכו',
 אמ' חכ' ז"ל לא ימהר אדם לגרש אשתו ראשונה אלא אם כן מצא בה ערות
 דבר: והיתה לאיש אחר הכת' קראו אחר לומ' שאין זה בן זוגו
 של ראשון שזה הוציא רשעה מתוך ביתו וזה הכנים רשעה לתוך ביתו: אם זוכה
 5 שני מגרשה שנ' ושנאה האיש האחרון ואם לאו קוברתו שנ' או
 כי ימות וכו': והיה אם לא תמצא חן בעיניו וכתב
 לה, מלמד שאינו מגרש אלא ברצונו: וכתב, כל כתב במשמע:
 וכתב, שאינה מתגרשת אלא בכתב: לה, שיהא הכתב לשמה: וכתב
 לה ספר, אין לי אלא ספר עלי קנים עלי אגוז עלי זית עלי חרוב מנ'
 10 ת"ל ונתן מכל מקום אם כן למה נא' ספר להוציא המחובר לקרקע
 שהרי הוא או' וכתב ונתן מי שאינו מחוסר אלא כתיבה ונתינה יצא
 מחובר שצריך כתיבה וקציצה ונתינה: ר' ישמעאל או' בשלשה מקומות הלכה
 עוקפת למקרא התורה אמרה אשר יצוד ציד חיה או עוף
 15 ושפך את דמו וכסוהו בעפר (ויק' י"ז י"ג) והלכה אמרה בכל
 דבר שהוא מגדל צמחים: התורה אמרה ולקחת את המרצע (דב'
 ט"ו י"ז) והלכה אמרה בכל דבר: התורה אמרה וכתב לה ספר
 כריתות: והלכה אמרה בכל דבר: כריתות, דבר הכורת בינו
 לבניה מכאן אמרו האו' לאשתו הרי זה גטיך על מנת שלא תשתי יין לעולם
 20 אין זה כריתות כל שלשים יום הרי זה כריתות: ספר כריתות ונתן
 בידה, מלמד שצריך ליתנו לה בתורת גירושין צריך שיאמר לה הרי זה
 גיטך: ונתן בידה, לרבות כל שהוא כידה כגון גנה וחצירה וקרקפה
 שנ' ויקח את כל ארצו מידו (במד' כ"א כ"ו) וכי בידו היתה
 אלא שהיתה ברשותו: ושלחה, לרצונה ושלא לרצונה: ושלחה, לא
 25 שישלח עצמו ממנה כגון שיאמר אני [בעליך] איני אישך איני ארוסיך אינו גט:

1 ומנין אף בשטר וכו' עד הוייה בשטר, ספרי ומ' 3 אמ'
 חכ' וכו', השוה משנה סוף גטין; וכעין זה בספרי ובמ' 4: נואולם מחברנו כיון אל
 דברי הגמרא סוף גטין שם וכן מובא בספר נור אלצלם, אמרו חכמים לא ימהר אדם
 לגרש את אשתו ראשונה אלא אם כן מצא בה ערות דבר; אבל במדרש החפץ הגרסה
 וצו חכמים שלא יגרש אשתו ראשונה אלא אם כן מצא בה ערות דבר: 4 הכת' וכו'
 עד או כי ימות, גטין צ' ע"א, וקצתו בספרי ובמ' 5: מלמד וכו' עד
 ברצונה מ' 6: כל וכו' מ' 7: 9 שאינה מתגרשת וכו', מ' 8, ועיין
 בהערות ר' דוד הופמאן שם: שיהא וכו', מ' 9, והשוה ספרי: 10 אין לי אלא
 וכו', ספרי ומ' והשוה גטין כ"א ע"ב: 13 ר' ישמעאל וכו', מ' 14 או עוף,
 במקרא או עוף אשר יאכל, ובמ' הובא בקצור כמו כאן: 16 דבר וכו'
 עד הרי זה כריתות, ספרי ומ' 21 מלמד וכו' מ' 22 לרבות
 וכו', השוה ספרי ומ' 24 לרצונה וכו', מ' 25 לא שישלח וכו',
 מ' 26:

ושילחה מביתו, והלא משיגיע גט לידה הרי היא מגורשת אע"פ שעדיין היא בבית אם כן למה נא' מביתו אלא שאם גירשה ולא הוציאה מביתו הרי הוא כמו שגירש והחזיר וצריכה ממנו גט שני לכך נא' ושלחה מביתו:

5 (ב.) והלכה והיתה לאיש אחר, שלא תינשא לקרוביו: עשרה תנאין יש בגט וסימנם רצונו: בכתב: הסירה: וכרת: לשמה: מחוסר: יתנו: בעדים: תורת: הבעל:

(ד.) לא יוכל בעלה הראשון, אין לי אלא הראשון שני שלישי מנ' ת"ל אשר שלחה מכל מקום: האיש האחרון 10 ושלחה מביתו, שלח מן האירוסין אסורה לחזור לו אם כן למה אחרי אשר הוטמאה לרבות שוטה שנסתרה וכן הו' או' הן ישלח איש את אשתו וכו' (ירמ' ג' א'), ד"א אחרי אשר הטמאה זו שזינת תחת בעלה שחזא אסורה על בעלה ולוקח עליה שני אחרי אשר הוטמאה והרי נטמאת: כי תועבה היא, ר' יהודה או' היא תועבה אין הולד תועבה: 15

(ה.) כי יקח איש אשה חדשה, אין לי אלא בתולה מנ' לרבות אלמנה ושומרת יבם ת"ל ושמח אשתו מכל מקום אם כן למה נא' חדשה מי שחדשה לו פרט למחזיר גרושתו ואלמנה לכהן גדול גרושה וחלוצה לכהן הדיוט: לא יצא בצבא, יכול בצבא הוא בלא יצא 20 אבל יתקן כלי זיין ויספק מים ומוון ת"ל לכל דבר:

20 (ו.) לא יחבל רחים ורכב, למה החובל רחיים ורכב לוקח שתי מלקות על זה בפני עצמו ועל זה בפני עצמו והרי הן בלאו אחד: אמרו רבות' ז'ל לפי שנ' רחים וכבר הוא כולל שתיהן שמשמע רחים שתיים

והלא וכו' עד לכך נא' ושלחה מביתו, מ"ת: 3 לכך נאמר ושלחה מביתו [לא מפני שחורה ובעלה לשם אישות כמו שפירש ר' דוד הופמאן, אלא משום שאין כאן שילוחין] 5 שלא תינשא וכו', מ"ת: 6 עשרה תנאין, רמב"ם ריש הלכות גירושין: ח"ל ועשרה דברים הם עיקר הגרשין מן התורה ואלו הן (א) שלא יגרש האיש אלא ברצונו: (ב) ושיגרש האיש בכתב ולא בדבר אחר: (ג) ושיהיה ענין הכתב שגירשה והסירה מקניינו: (ד) ושיהיה ענינו דבר הכורת בינו לביתה: (ה) ושיהיה נכתב לשמה: (ו) ושלא יהיה מחוסר מעשה אחר כתיבתו אלא נתינתו בלבד: (ז) ושיתנה לה: (ח) שיתנה לה בפני עדים: (ט) ושיתנה לה בחזרת גירושין: (י) ושיהיה הבעל או שלוחו הוא הנותן לה: 8 אין לי וכו' עד מכל מקום, מ"ת: 10 שלח וכו' עד את אשתו, ספרי ומ"ת: 12 ד"א וכו' עד והרי נטמאת, מ"ת: [ואחר קניו וסתירה אסורה גם אם אינו ידוע שזינתה, ובודאי זינתה אסורה גם בלי קניו וסתירה, ולחנם טרח ר' דוד הופמאן בפרוש דברים אלו עיי"ש במ"ת ע' 156 הערה ו'] 14 ר' יהודה וכו' עד ואין הולד תועבה, ספרי ומ"ת: 16 אין לי וכו' עד לכל דבר, ספרי ומ"ת: 17 למה וכו', השהה ספרי ומ"ת וב"מ קט"ו ע"א; ויר"ו מיר פ"ו ה"ב ע"ה ע"א: 22 אמרו רבות' וכו', ירו' שם:

העליונה והתחתונה ולא הוסיף ורכב אלא כרי שיהיה חייב ע[ל] [ש]ניהם
 שמים: רחים ורכב, מה רחים ורכב מיוחדין שני כלים אע"פ שמשמשין
 מלאכה אחת וחייבין על זה בפני עצמו ועל זה בפני עצמו כך כל שני כלים
 שמשמשין מלאכה אחת חייב על זה בפני עצמו ועל זה בפני עצמו: וכל
 דבר שעושין בו אוכל נפש כגון רחים למחינה ועריבה ללישה וקדרה לתבשיל
 5 אפ' עץ הפרור ת"ל כי נפש הוא חובל ואם עבר וחבל יחזיר ואם אבד המשכון
 לוקה:

(נ.) כי ימצא איש גונב נפש מאחיו, למה נא' לפי שהוא
 או' וגונב איש ומכרו ונמצא בידו (שמות כ"ט ט"ז) אין לי
 10 אלא עדים למכירה עדים לגניבה מנ' ת"ל כי ימצא איש גונב
 נפש שאין ימצא אלא בעדים: איש פרט לקטן: גונב נפש, בין
 איש בין אשה בין קטן: ומת הגנב, ואזהרתיה מלא תגנב ואינו חייב חנק
 עד שיגנב וימכור או ישתמש בו כדרך שמשמשין בעבדים שנ' והתעמר
 בו ומכרו:

(ח.) השמר בנגע הצרעת, הרי זה בא ללמד על התולש את
 15 סימניו ועל הכוהה את מחייתו ועל הקוצץ את בהרתו שיהא עובר בלא תעשה
 כל מקום שנ' השמר או פן או אל הרי הוא בלא תעשה: ככל אשר יורו
 אתכם או אפ' הורו שלא כתורה ת"ל כאשר צויתם תשמרו
 לעשות:

(ט.) זכור את אשר עשה יי אלה' למרים, וכי מה
 20 ענין זה לזה אלא ללמד שאין הנעים באין אלא על המהרהר אחר הזקנים
 ועל האומר לשון הרע והרי הדברים קל וחומר מה אם מרים הצדקת כך
 נענשה אחרים על אחת כמה וכמה:

(י.) כי תשה ברעך משאת מאומה, למה נא' לפי שהוא
 25 אומ' אם חבל תחבל שלמת רע' (שמות כ"ב כ"ה) שומיע אני
 שהוא רשאי למשכנו ת"ל לא תבא אל ביתו לעבט עבוטו:
 (יא.) בחוץ תעמד, מכאן אמרו בעלי חוב נפרעין מן הוברית
 אלא שגורו חכמים בבבונת מפני תיקון העולם:

2 מה רחים וכו' עד ועל זה בפני עצמו, ספרי ומ'ת: 14 וכל
 דבר וכו', ב"מ קט"ו ע"א: ■ כי ימצא וכו' עד אלא בעדים, מ'ת:
 11 פרט לקטן, ספרי ומ'ת: 11 גונב נפש וכו', עיין במ'ת ובהערת ר' דוד
 הופמאן שם: ואזהרתיה מלא תגנב, עיין מכילתא יתרו מסכת דבחדש,
 פ"ח (ה"ר ע' 232); מכילתא דרשב"י כ' ט"ו (ע' 112); וכן במ'ת ה' י"ז (ע' 23):
 12 ואינו חייב וכו', כר' יהודה בספרי ובסנהדרין פ"א מ"ב: 16 הרי זה
 וכו' עד הרי הוא בלא תעשה, מ'ת: 17 ככל וכו' עד תשמרו לעשות,
 מ'ת: 20 וכו' עד על אחת כמה וכמה, מ'ת ומקצתו בספרי: 24 כי
 תשה וכו' עד לעבט עבוטו, מ'ת: 27 מכאן אמרו וכו' עד תיקון
 העולם, מ'ת: גטין ג' ע"א, אמר עולא דבר תורה בעל חוב בויבורית שנאמר בחוץ
 תעמוד והאיש וגו' מה דרכו של איש להוציא פחות שבכלים. 28 בבבונת, כן הוא בכ"י:

(יב.) [וא]ם איש עני הוא, אין לי אלא עני עשיר מנ' ת"ל
ואם איש אש כן למה נאמ' עני ממחר אני ליפרע על ידי עני יתר מן
העשיר מכאן אמרו המלוה את חברו אחד עני ואחד עשיר לא ימשכנו אלא
בבית דין:

5 (יג.) השב תשיב לו את העבוט כבוא השמש, זו
כסות הלילה אין לי אלא כסות לילה שהוא מחזירה בלילה כסות יום שהוא
מחזירה ביום מנ' ת"ל עד בא השמש תשיבנו לו: (שמות כ"ב
כ"ה) זו כסות יום: ולך תהיה צדקה, אמ' ר' יצחק מנ' לבעל חוב
שקונה משכון שנ' ולך תהיה צדקה אם אינו קונה צדקה מנין מכאן
10 לבעל חוב שקונה המשכון: לפני יי אלה', לפני משלש מחצות חשך
מבחוץ ענן מבפנים ערפל לפני פנים:

(יד.) לא תעשק שכר עני ואביון, והלא כבר נא' לא
תגול (ויק' י"ט י"ג) מלמד שכל הכובש שכר שכיר עובר בחמשה שמות משום
בל תעשק ובל תגול ומשום בל תלין פעולת שכיר (שם) ומשום ביומו
15 תתן שכרו ומשום ולא תבוא עליו השמש:

(טו.) ביומו תתן שכרו ולא תבא עליו השמש,
זה שכיר לילה שהוא גובה כל היום אין לי אלא שכיר לילה שהוא גובה כל
היום שכיר יום שהוא גובה כל הלילה מנין ת"ל לא תלין פעולת שכיר
אתך עד בקר (ויק' י"ט י"ג): וא"ליו הוא נושא את נפשו,
20 הרי זו אזהרה לפועל שיעשה בכל כחו: והיה כך חטא, שלשה
דברים נפרעין מן האדם מגופו אבל לא מממונו ואלו הן הכובש שכר שכיר
והנודר ואינו מקיים והמעלים עיניו מן הצדקה: הכובש שכר שכיר דכת'
ביומו תתן שכרו וכת' ביה והיה כך חטא ולא בממונו:
והנודר ואינו מקיים דכת' כי תדר נדר (דב' כ"ג כ"ב) וכת' ביה
25 והיה כך חטא ולא בממונו:

(טז.) לא יומתו אבות על בנים ובנ' לא יומתו
על אביו, לא בא הכתוב ללמד אלא שלא יומתו אבות בעדות בנים ובנים
בעדות האבות (ומכאן לעדות קרובים שהיא פסולה: ד"א לא יומתו
אבות על בנים, שלא יהיו העדים קרובים לבעלי דינין ומנין אף

1 אין לי אלא וכו' עד יתר מן העשיר, ספרי ומ"ת: 3 מכאן
אמרו וכו' עד אלא בבית דין, מ"ת ועיין בהערת ר' דוד הופמאן שם:
17 זו כסות הלילה וכו' עד זו כסות יום, מ"ת: 8 אמר ר'
יצחק וכו' עד ערפל לפני לפני, מ"ת: 11 לפני לפני, זו היא
הגרסה הנכונה גם במ"ת, עיין בחלופי גרסאות שם ע' 256: 17 והלא וכו' עד ולא
תבא עליו השמש, מ"ת: 17 זה שכיר וכו' עד עד בקר, ספרי
ומ"ת: 20 הרי זו אזהרה וכו' עד כחו, מ"ת: 20 שלשה וכו' עד סוף
הענין, מ"ת: 26 לא יומתו וכו' עד שהיא פסולה, עיין ספרי, ומ"ת,
ומנהדרין כז' ע"ב: 28 ד"א וכו' עד שנ' ובנים לא יומתו על
אבות, מ"ת:

הדיינים שנ' ובנים לא יומתו על אבות: לא יומתו אבות על בנים, והלא כת' בעכן ואת בניו ואת בנותיו (יה' ז' כ"ד) אם הוא חטא בניו ובנותיו מה חטאו ולטעמך כל ישראל חטאו אלא לרדותן וישרפו אותם באש ויסקלו אותם באבנים תרתי אמ' רבינא הראוי לשריפה לשריפה והראוי לסקלה לסקלה:

5 (יז.) לא תטה משפט גר יתום, מלמד שכל המטה דינו של גר עובר בשני לאוין ואם היה גר יתום עובר בשלשה לאוין: ולא תחבל בגד אלמנה, בין ענייה בין עשירה ר' ישמעאל או' בא הכת' ללמדך רחק מן הכיעור ומן הדומה לכיאור הא כיצד נכנס למשכנה כסות היום בלילה ונסות הלילה ביום להחזיר לה כסות היום ביום וכסות הלילה בלילה עכשו 10 הן אומרים חשוד הוא עמה:

(יח.) וזכרת כי עבד היית, מה עניין יציאת מצרים כאן אלא שלא תאמר הרני ממשכן בגד אלמנה בסתר וכי מי מודיע בגלוי אמ' המקום דעו מה עשיתי למצרים שהיו מעשיהן בסתר ופרסמתים בגלוי: 15 (יט.) כי תקצר, פרט לשקצרוהו גוים: כי תקצר ושכחת עומר, עומר שסביבותיו קציר שכחה אבל עומר שסביבותיו קמה אינו שכחה: ושכחת עומר, יכול אחד ולא שנים ת"ל לעני ולגר תעז' אות' (ויק' י"ט י') אחד לעני ואחד לגר מכאן אמרו שני עמרים שכחה ושלשה אינם שכחה: בשדה, לרבות הטמונין בשדה כגון הלוקף והשום 20 והבצלים לא תשוב לקחתו:

(כ.) כי תחבט זיתך לא תפאר, שלא תיטול תפארתו ממנו מגיד שהזית חייב בפאה והוא הדין לשאר כל האילנות (ד"א לא תפאר אחרריך, אל תתפאר לעני בו מכאן אמ' רז"ל המסייע לאחד מן העניים או שמניח אחד ואחד אינו מניח הרי זה גזול את העניים ועל זה נא' אל תסיג גבול עולם (דב' י"ט י"ד): אחרריך זו שכחה: 25 (כא.) כי תבצר כרמך לא תעולל, מכאן היה ר' אליעזר או' כרם שכולו עוללות לבעל הבית ר' עקיבה או' לעניים: לגר ליתום

3 אם הוא חטא וכו' עד והראוי לסקלה לסקלה, סנהדרין מ"ד ע"א: 6 מלמד וכו' עד בשלשה לאוין, מ"ת וספרי: 8 בין ענייה וכו' עד חשוד הוא עמה, מ"ת: 9 הכיעור, כן הוא בכ"י בפעם הראשונה בעין, ובשניה באלף: 12 מה עניין וכו' עד ופרסמתים בגלוי, מ"ת: 16 פרט וכו', ספרי, מ"ת: 16 עומר וכו' עד אינו שכחה, מ"ת ירו' פיאה פ"ו ה"ז (י"ט ע"ג): 17 יכול אחד וכו' עד ושלשה אינם שכחה, מ"ת: 19 לרבות וכו' עד והבצלים, מ"ת: 21 שלא תיטול וכו' עד האילנות, מ"ת: 22 ד"א וכו' עד גבול עולם, שמתי בחצי עגולים מפני שחסר בכ"י ונוסף על הגליון, ונמצא בספרי ובמ"ת: 26 מכאן וכו' עד ר' ע אומר לעניים, ספרי ומ"ת:

ולא למנה יהיה, מצות עשה, מכאן אמרו ארבע מתנות בכרם הפרט והעוללות והשכחה והפיאה דכת' וכרמך לא תעולל ופרט כרמך לא תלקט (ויק' י"ט י') וכת' כי תבצר כרמך לא תעולל אחריו ואמ' ר' לוי אחריו זו שכחה, פיאה גמר אחריו אחריו מותים דכת' כי תחבט זיתך לא תפאר אחריו: ושלש מתנות בתבואה הלקט והשכחה והפיאה, ובקצרכם את קציר ארצכם לא תכלה פאת שדך בקצ' ולקט קצירך לא תל' (ויק' י"ט ט') וכת' כי תקצר וכו' ושכחת עומר בשדה: ושתיים באילן השכחה והפיאה דכת' כי תחבט זיתך לא תפאר אחריו ותאנא דבי ר' ישמעאל שלא תיטול תפארתו ממנו: אחריו זו שכחה: כולן אין בהן טובת הנאה לבעלים מאי טעמא עויבא כתיבא בהו ואפ' עני שבישראל מוציאין אותן מידו דכת' לא תלקט לעני להזהיר על שלו:

(כב.) וזכרת כי עבד היית בארץ מצ', וכי מה ענין ארץ מצרים לכאן כבר פירשנוהו לעיל:

(כ"ה. א.) כי יהיה ריב בין אנשים, למה נאמ' לפי שהוא או' לא תזרע כרמך כלאים (דב' כ"ב ט') לא תלבש שעטנז (שם י"א) לא תחרש בשור ובחמר (שם י') שומע אני אם זרע וחרש ולבש עבר על המצוה ויהא פטור תל' כי יהיה ריב בין אנשים בא הכת' ולימד על העובר בלא תעשה שיהא לוקה ארבעים לכך נאמ' הפרשה: במצוה בלא תעשה הכת' מדבר שנ' והיה אם בן הכות הרשע הרי אתה דן נא' כאן בן ונא' להלן בן (דב' כ"א י"ח) מה בן להלן במצוה בלא תעשה הכת' מדבר אף כאן בלא תעשה הכת' מדבר: ומנ' שבבעל דין ובשני עדים הכת' מדבר שנ' והצדיקו את הצדיק והרש' את הר' לא אמרתי אלא מי שאחרים מצדיקין ומרשיעין אותו יצאו דיני ממונות שאדם מרשיע בהן עצמו: בין אנשים איש ואשה ואשה עם אשה מנ' תל' ונגשו אל המש' מכל מקום: ושפטום, בעל כרחם: והצדיקו את הצדיק והרש' את הרשע, ללמדך שיהיו בקיאים בדין: והרשיעו את הר', יכול כל המורשעין לוקין תל' והיה אם בן הכות הרשע פעמים לוקה פעמים אינו לוקה הא

1 ומצות עשה, מ"ת: מכאן אמרו וכו' עד להזהיר על שלו, חולין קלא' ע"א: 15 כבר פירשנוהו לעיל, פסוק י"ח: 16 למה וכו' עד הפרשה, מ"ת: 21 במצוה וכו' עד מרשיע בהן עצמו, כעין זה במ"ת, בסגנון שונה מעט: במצוה בלא תעשה, נהשוה המובא למעלה ואם כן יש לנו שני מקורות שונים, ועיין גם כן למטה פסוק ג' 26 איש וכו' עד מכל מקום, ספרי ומ"ת: 27 בעל כרחם, ספרי ומ"ת, והשוה ספרי דברים פי' קמ"ד: במ"ת הגרסה בעל כרחם: 28 שיהיו וכו', מ"ת: 29 יכול וכו' עד הרי הוא לוקה' עליה, ספרי ומ"ת: המורשעין, כן הגרסה לנכון גם במ"ת עיין בתקונים ע' 256:

כי צד ת"ל לא תחסם שור בדישו מה חסימת השור מיוחדת שהיא מצות לא תעשה שאין בה קום עשה והרי הוא לוקה עליה כך כל מצות לא תעשה שאין בה קום עשה הרי הוא לוקה עליה: ד"א ונגשו אל המשפט ושפט' מכאן אמ' מכות בשלשה דאמר רב הונא ושפטום הרי כאן שנים אין בית דין שקול מוסיפין אחד: והצדיקו את הצ' וכו' אמ' עולא רמז לעדים וזממין שלוקין מן התורה כל' עדים שהצדיקו את הרשע או הרשיעו הצדיק ואתו עדים אחרים ואזימנהו והצדיקו את הצדיק דמיעקרא ושוניהו להני רשעים:

(ב.) והיה אם בן הכות הרשע והפילו השופט, מכאן אמ' אינו מכה אותו לא עומד ולא יושב אלא מוטה שנא' והפילו: והכהו, מכאן שאין מכין שנים כאחד: והכהו, ולא כסותו: אמ' רב ששת מנ' לרצועה שהיא של עגל דכת' ארבעים יכנו וסמך לה לא תחסם; ויש או' של חמור אמר הקב"ה יבוא מי שמכיר אבוס בעליו ויפרע ממי שאינו מכיר אבוס בעליו דכת' ידע שור קונהו וחמור אבוס בעליו (ישע' א' ג'): והכהו לפניו, שיהא לוקה ועיניו בו לא כדרך שאחרים עושים שזה לוקה וזה עסוק בדבר אחר: והכהו לפניו כדי רשעתו, מכהו כדי רשעה אחת מלפניו ושתי רשעיות מאחוריו מכאן אמ' מכה אותו שליש מלפניו ושתי ידות מאחוריו: כדי רשעתו, מכאן שאומדין את הנלקה: כדי רשעתו, רשעה אחת אתה מחייבו ואין אתה מחייבו שתי רשעיות מכאן שאין אדם לוקה ומשלם ולא לוקה ומת: במספר, שיהיו המכות במניין מכאן אמרו המכה מכה והמונה מונה והקורא קורא אם לא תשמר לעשות והפלה יי את מכו' וכו' (דב' כ"ח נ"ח): תאנא גדול שבדיינים קורא והשני מונה והשלישי אומ' הכהו:

(ג.) ארבעים יכנו, הוא ארבעים חסר אחת שנא' ארבעים במספר מניין שהוא סמוך לארבעים: לא יוסיף הא אם הוסיף עובר בלא תעשה אין לי אלא בזמן שמוסיף על המניין (מוסיף על האומדן)

4 מכאן אמרו וכו', מ"ת וסנהדרין י' ע"א: דאמר רב הונא וכו', סנהדרין שם: 6 אמר עולא וכו', מכות ב' ע"ב: 10 מכאן אמרו וכו' עד שני' והפילו, מ"ת: 11 מכאן עד כסותו, ספרי ומ"ת: 11 אמר רב ששת וכו' עד לא תחסם, מכות כ"ז ע"א, ושם אמר רב ששת משום ראב"ע: 13 ויש אומ' וכו', עיין מכות שם: 15 שיהא וכו' עד בדבר אחר, מ"ת, ובסגנון שונה מעט גם בספרי: 17 מכהו וכו' עד מאחוריו, מ"ת: 18 מכאן וכו', השה סנהדרין י' ע"א: ובסגנון שלפנינו מובא גם בנור אלצלם, ונראה שהוא לקוח ממכילתא לדברים ואעפ"י שחסר במ"ת. 19 רשעה אחת וכו' עד והפלה ה' את מכו', מ"ת: 24 תאנא וכו' עד הכהו, מכות כ"ז ע"א: 25 הוא וכו', עיין ספרי ומ"ת: 26 הא אם וכו' עד מכל מקום, ספרי ומ"ת, המוסגר חסר בנוף הכי' ונוסף על הגליון: אמנם בנור אלצלם ובמדרש החפץ הנרסה יותר פשוטה לא יוסיף על הארבעים פן יוסיף על האומדן.

מניין ת"ל פן יוסיף מכל מקום: והרי דברים קל וחומר מה אם מי שהוא מזהר להכותו הרי הוא מזהר שלא להכותו מי שהוא מזהר שלא להכותו דין הוא שיהא מזהר שלא להכותו: מכה רבה אין לי אלא מכה מרובה מועטת מנ' ת"ל על אלה אם כן למה נא' רבה לימד על הראשונות שהן מכה רבה: מכאן אמרו מת תחת ידו פטור הוסיף לו רצועה אחת ומת הרי זה גולה על ידו: ונקלה אחיך לעיניך, כיון שנקלה נפטור, מכאן אמרו נתקלקל בין ברעי בין במים פטור ואחד האיש ואחד האשה: ד"א ונקלה אחיך לעיניך משלקה הרי הוא אחיך מכאן אמרו כל חייבי בריתות שלקו נפטרו מידי כריתן:

10 (ד.) לא תחסם שור בדישו: (לימד על חייבי לאוין שהן במלקות שנ' ארבעים יכנו וסמך ליה לא תחסם שור בדישו): אין לי אלא שור מניין שאר בהמה כשור הרי אתה דן נאמר כאן שור ונאמר בסיני שור מה שור שנאמר בסיני עשה את כל הבהמה כשור אף שור שנאמר כאן עשה שאר כל בהמה כשור: בדישו, מנ' לרבות שאר כל עבדות ת"ל לא תחסם מכל מקום אם כן למה נאמר בדישו מה דייש מיוחד דבר שגידולי קרקע ופועל אוכל בו אף כל גידולי קרקע פועל אוכל בו יצא החולב והמחבץ והמגבן שאין גידולי קרקע ואין פועל אוכל בהן: לא תחסם שור בדישו, בדיש שהוא ראוי יצא הקדש שאינו ראוי לפיכך חוסמו בדיש הקדש: לא תחסם אחד שחסמה בשעת מלאכה ואחד שחסמה מקודם ודש בה והיא חסומה אפ' חסמה בקול לוקה שנ' לא תחסם מכל מקום: 15 (ה.) כי ישבו אחים יחדו, למה נאמ' לפי שהוא או' ערות אשת אחיך לא תגלה (ויקרא י"ח ט"ז) לא תגלה שומע אני בין שיש לו בנים בין שאין לו בנים ת"ל ובן אין לו בא הכת' ולימד על אשת אחיו שאם מת בלא בנים שתהא מותרת להנשא לאחיו לכך נאמרה הפרשה: 25 (כי ישבו אחים, מכאן אמ' יבמה שנפלה לפני מוכה שחין אין חוסמין אותה שנ' לא תחסם שור בדישו וסמך ליה כי ישבו

והרי דברים וכו' עד מזהר שלא להכותו, מ"ת: 3 אין לי וכו' עד שהן מכה רבה, ספרי, ומ"ת: 5 מכאן אמרו וכו' עד גולה על ידו, מ"ת: 6 כיון וכו' עד ואחד האשה, מ"ת והמשפט מכאן, עד ואחד האשה, מובא גם בספרי: 8 משלקה וכו' עד כריתו, ספרי ומ"ת: 10 לימד וכו', המוסגר חסר בגוף הכי' ונוסף על הגליון; ועיין למעלה על פסוק א': 12 אין לי אלא וכו' עד ואין פועל אוכל בהן, מ"ת וקטעים ממנו גם בספרי: 19 בדיש וכו' עד בדיש הקדש, עיין מעילה י"ג ע"א: אחד שחסמה וכו' עד מכל מקום, מ"ת, ועיין הערת ר' דוד הופמאן שם: 21 למה וכו', עד הפרשה, מ"ת: 26 מכאן אמרו וכו', המוסגר חסר בגוף המדרש, ונשלם על הגליון; ובדבר תכנו השוה יבמות ד' ע"א ושם "א"ר שש א"ר אלעזר משום ר' אלעזר בן עזריה מניין ליבמה שנפלה לפני מוכה שחין שאין חוסמין אותה שנאמר לא תחסם שור בדישו וסמך ליה כי ישבו אחים יחדו:

אחים (חדו): כי ישבו אחים, באחים מן האב הכת' מדבר
נא' כאן אחים ונא' להלן שנים עשר אחים (ברא' מ"ב י"ג)
מה להלן אחים מן האב אף כאן אחים מן האב: ר' יצחק אר' נא' כאן והיה
הבכור אשר תלד ונא' להלן בכור (רב' כ"א ט"ו) מה בכור
שנא' להלן באחים מן האב אף כאן באחים מן האב: כי ישבו אחי' 5
יחדו, שהיתה להם ישיבה בעולם כאשר פרט לאשת אחיו שלא היה בעולמו:
יחדו, המיוחדין בנחלה פרט לאחים מן האם: ובן אין לו, אין לי
אלא בן בן הבן ובת ובת הבת וטומטום ואנדרגינז' מנ' ת"ל אין לו מכל מקום
אם כן למה נא' ובן פרט לשיש לו מן השפחה ומן הנכרית שאינו קרוי בנו:
לא תהיה אשת המת, פרט לאשת שוטה וקטן אבל אשת החרש 10
או חולצת או מתיבמת: החוצה, להוציא הקרובים: ד"א החוצה,
להביא את הארוסה: יבמה יבוא עליה, מצות עשה מצוה בלא
תעשה מנ' ת"ל לא תהיה אשת המת החוצה: יבמה יבוא
עליה, מצוה לפי שהיתה בכלל התר ונאסרה וחזרה והותרה יכול תחזור 15
להתירה הראשון ת"ל יבמה יבא עליה מצוה. כיצא בו מצות
תאכל (ויק' ו' ט') מצוה לפי שהיתה בכלל היתר ונאסרה וחזרה והותרה
יכול תחזור להתירה הראשון ת"ל מצות תאכל מצוה: יבמה יבוא
עליה, יכול אף היא אחת מכל העריות האמורות בתורה ת"ל ולקחה
לו לאשה בראויה לו לאשה הכת' מדבר: יבמה יבוא עליה,
מלמד שהיא נקנית בביאה: יכול יהא כסף ושטר גומרין בה כדרך שביאה 20
גומרת בה ת"ל ויבמה ביאה גומרת בה ואין כסף ושטר גומרין בה: מצות
יבום קודמת למצות חליצה לפי שהיתה קודם במתן תורה: יבמה יבוא
עליה, לא עליה ועל צרתה, מכאן אמ' הכונס את יבמתו נאסרו צרותיה
עליו ועל שאר האחים:

1 באחים וכו' עד אף כאן באחים מן האב, מ"ת, ובמשפט השני נשתנה
הסגנון כאן: 6 שהיתה וכו' עד מן האם, מ"ת, וחלק ממנו גם בספרי: 7 אין
לי וכו' עד קרוי בנו, מ"ת: 9 פרט וכו' עד או מתיבמת, מ"ת:
11 להוציא הקרובים, השה מ"ת, ושם באריכות יתירה נקרובים, שאם
היתה קרובה לו אינה מתיבמת ולא אמרין כיון שהותר איסור אשת אח גם שאר איסורים
הותרו בה. ור' דה"פ לא דק בזה. ועיין למטה יכול אפי' היא אחת מכל
עריות דרשה אחרת בענין זה] 12 להביא וכו', מ"ת: ועיין בהערת ר' דוד
הופמאן שם: מצות וכו' עד תאכל מצוה, מ"ת: ח"כ צו פרשה ב' ה"ט,
ועל ידי דמיון המלים נשמט המוסגר בחצי רבועים והשלמתי על פי מ"ת: 17 יכול
וכו' עד ואין כסף ושטר גומרין בה, מ"ת: 21 נמצות יבום
קודמת וכו', מחלוקת עתיקה בזה בין התנאים, וכן בין הראשונים, עיין בגמ' שכתר
ח"ב ע' ר"ע אולם השעם הוה שייבום קודם לפי שהיה קודם מתן תורה לא נמצא במקור
אחר] 23 לא וכו' עד שאר האחים, מ"ת:

(ו.) והיה הבכור אשר תלד, מכאן שמצוה בגדול ליבם: אשר תלד, פרט לאילונית שאינה יולדת: יקום על שם אחיו, וכול אם היה שמו יוחנן קורין לו יוחנן שמו יוסף קורין שמו יוסף אלא יקום בנחלה ת"ל יקום על שם אחיו ונא' להלן' על שם אחיהם יקראו בנחלתם (ברא' מ"ח ו') מה להלן בנחלה אף כאן בנחלה וכן הו' או' להקים שם המת על נחלתו (רות ד' ח') גזרה שווה אפקא פיסוקא מפשוטיה: ולא ימחה שמו מישראל פרט לסריס ששמו מחוי: ועלתה יבמתו השערה, מגיד שבית דין בכל עיר ועיר:

(ז.) ועלתה יבמתו השערה, מגיד שהיבמה מרדפת אחר היבם: ואמרה מאן יבמי להקים לאחיו שם, פרט לסריס שאם רצה להקים אינו יכול: שם, מה שם האמור להלן זרע אף שם האמור כאן זרע:

(ח.) וקראו לו זקני עירו, מצוה בזקני עירו: ודברו אליו, אבל לא שמענו מה היו מדברין אליו ת"ל ועמד ואמר לא חפצתי לקחתה מגיד שהן פותחין לו בייבום: ועמד ואמ', מלמד שאין אומרים דברים אלו אלא בעמידה:

(ט.) ונגשה יבמתו אליו, מלמד שמתחדת עמו לעיני הזקנים: וחלצה נעלו, אין לי אלא נעל שלו של כל אדם מנ' ת"ל חלוץ הנעל מכל מקום אם כן מה ת"ל נעלו הראוי לו פרט לגדול שאינו יכול להלך בו ולקטן שאינו חופה את רוב רגלו ופרט לסנדל וסוליים שאין לו עקב: וחלצה, ולא שיחלוץ הוא: וחלצה, אפ' בשניה מכאן אמרו גרמת חולצת בשניה לכתחלה: מעל רגלו, נאמ' כאן רגלו ונאמר להלן רגלו מה להלן רגלו הימנית אף כאן רגלו הימנית: וירקה בפניו, ר' יונתן או' בפניו על הארץ אתה אומ' [כן] או בפניו כשמועו הא מה אני מקיים לא יתיצב איש בפניכם (דב' י"א כ"ה) כשמועו הא מה ת"ל וירקה בפניו על הארץ: דא וירקה בפניו יכול

1 מכאן וכו' עד ליבם, ספרי ומ"ת: 2 פרט וכו', ספרי ומ"ת וגרסת הספרי היא, 'פרט לאילונית ושאניה ראויה לילד'; אבל במ"ת, בנור אלצלם ובמדרש החפץ הגרסה כמו בקטע זה: 3 יכול וכו' עד אף כאן בנחלה, יבמות כ"ד ע"א, ספרי ומ"ת, בסננון שונה הרבה: 7 פרט וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 8 מגיד וכו', מ"ת: 10 מגיד וכו', מ"ת: 11 פרט עד אינו יכול, ספרי ומ"ת: 12 מה שם וכו' עד כאן זרע, ספרי ומ"ת: 14 מצוה וכו', ספרי ומ"ת: 15 אבל וכו' עד בייבום, מ"ת: 16 מלמד עד בעמידה, ספרי ומ"ת: 18 מלמד וכו' עד שאין לו עקב, ספרי ומ"ת: 22 ולא שיחלוץ הוא וכו' עד לכתחלה, מ"ת: 23 נאמר כאן וכו' עד אף כאן רגלו הימנית, ספרי ומ"ת: 25 ר' יונתן וכו' עד בפניו על הארץ, מ"ת: 27 ד"א וכו', ספרי ומ"ת:

ממש ת"ל לעיני הזקנים רוק שנראה לעיני הזקנים: בפניו, פרט
 לסומה שאינו רואה הרוק ואם חלץ חליצתו כשרה: וענתה ואמרה
 נא' כאן עניה ונאמ' להלן ענייה מה להלן בלשון הקדש אף כאן בלשון הקדש:
 ככה יעשה, בחליצה היא יוצאה אינה יוצאה בגש: תנו רבנן אלו מותרות
 לבעליהן ואסורות ליבמיהן ומותרות ליבמיהן ואסורות לבעליהן אסורות לאלו
 5 ואלו מותרות לאלו ואלו הן מותרות לבעליהן ואסורות ליבמיהן כגון
 כהן הדיוט שנשא את האלמנה ויש לו אח כהן גדול או כשר שנשא כשרה ויש
 לו אח חלל או ישראל שנשא ישראלית ויש לו אח ממזר או ממזר שנשא ממזרת
 ויש לו אח ישראל ואלו מותרות ליבמיהן ואסורות לבעליהן כגון כהן גדול
 שקידש את האלמנה ויש לו אח כהן הדיוט או כשר שנשא חללה ויש לו אח
 10 חלל או ישראל שנשא ממזרת ויש לו אח ממזר או ממזר שנשא ישראלית ויש
 לו אח ישראל אלו אסורות לאלו ואלו כגון כהן גדול שנשא את האלמנה ויש
 לו אח כהן גדול או כהן הדיוט שנשא חללה ויש לו אח כשר או ישראל שנשא
 ממזרת ויש לו אח ישראל או ממזר שנשא ישראלית ויש לו אח ממזר ושאר כל
 15 הגוים מותרות לבעליהן וליבמיהן:

(י.) ונקרא שמו בישראל למה נא' לפי שהוא או' ונגשה
 יבמתו אליו לעיני הזקנים אין לי אלא זקנים הדיוטות מנין
 ת"ל ונקרא שמו בישראל מכאן אמרו החלוצה צריכה שלשה
 שיעדין להקרות ואם היו הדיוטות כשרים ומצותה בחמשה כדי לפרסם הדבר
 20 ואותן השנים אפלו היו עמי הארץ: בית חלוץ הנעל, מכאן אמרו
 החלוצה קונה עצמה בחליצה ובמיתת היבם: בחליצה מנא לן דכת' ונקרא
 שמו בישראל בית חלוץ הנעל* כיון שחליצה לו נעל הותרה לכל ישראל:
 במיתת היבם מנא לן מקל וחומר ומה אשת איש שהיא בחנק מיתת בעל מתרתה
 25 [וצ"ל מתירתה] זו שהיא בלאו לא כל שכן: בית חלוץ הנעל,
 ר' יהודה אומ' מצוה על כל העומדים שם לומ' חלוץ הנעל חלוץ הנעל שלשה

1 פרט לסומה וכו' עד כשרה, עיין יבמות ק"ג ע"א, וברמב"ם ה' חליצה
 פ"ד ה"ח: 3 נאמר כאן וכו' עד אף כאן בלשון הקדש, ספרי
 ומ"ת: 4 בחליצה וכו', מ"ת ועיין שם: 4 אלו מותרות וכו' עד ושאר
 כל הגוים מותרות לבעליהן וליבמיהן, כל זה נמצא בשנויים קטני
 ערך במשנה יבמות ריש פרק ט'; ותימה שהביאו בעל המדרש בשם תנו רבנן; ועוד ששינה
 הלשון, למשל במשנה הנוסח יש מותרות במקום אלו מותרות: 7 כשר שנשא
 כשרה, במשנה הגרסה, "חלל שנשא כשרה ויש לו אח כשר" אבל לפי נוסח
 הברייתא קשה הלא אין שום איסור לחלל לישא כשרה; שלא הוזהרו כשרות להנשא
 לפסולים (קדושין ע"ז ע"א): 16 למה וכו' עד עמי הארץ, מ"ת, ועיין
 ברמב"ם ה' יבום וחליצה פ"ד ה"ח, ובהערת ר' דוד הופמאן למ"ת: 20 מכאן
 אמרו וכו' עד ובמיתת היבם, מ"ת: 21 בחליצה מנא לן וכו' עד
 הותרה לכל ישראל, קדושין י"ד ע"א: 23 במיתת היבם וכו' עד
 בלאו לא כל שכן, שם: 25 ר' יהודה וכו' עד שלשה פעמים,
 ספרי, ומ"ת:

פעמים: כיצד סדר חליצה קורא היא תחלה מאן יבמי להקים
לאחיו שם בישראל לא אבה יבמי וצריכה לקרות לא
אבה בנשימה אחת ואחר כך תאמר יבמי: ואחר כך קורא הוא לה
לא חפצתי לקחתה ואחר כך תחלוץ ואחר כך תרוק ואחר כך
תקרא ככה יעשה לאיש אשר לא יבנה את בית אחיו
5 ונקרא שמו בישראל בית חלוץ הנעל ואין הסדר מעכב:
ונקרא שמו בישראל, ר' שמעון או' הוא לא רצה להקים לאחיו שם
בישראל אף הוא יבוא ויטול לו שם מתוך שם מה יקרא ונקרא שמו
בישראל בית חלוץ הנעל:

10 (יא.) כי ינצו, למה נאמ' לפי שהוא או' עין תחת עין
(שמות כ"א כ"ד) אבל לבושת לא שמענו ת"ל כי ינצו אנשים לכך
נא' הפרשה: איש ואחיו, פרט לעבדים שאין להם אחוה: והחזיקה
במבושיו, עד שתהא מתכוונת מגיד שאינו חייב על הבשת עד שיהא
מתכוין מכאן אמרו המבייש את הישן חייב וישן שבייש פטור: מיד מכהו,
וכי יש לו רשות להכותו אלא מיד שליח בית דין: ושלחה ידה
15 והחזיקה במבושיו, בכל דבר שהוא מביישו דברי ר' ישמעאל
ר' עקיבא או' והחזיקה במבושיו כשמועו:

(יב.) וקצות את כפה, לפי שהוא או' ושלחה ידה אין
לי אלא שמאל ימין מנ' ת"ל וקצות את כפה: וקצות את כפה,
20 שתהא חייבת לשלם את הבשת: לא תחוס עינ', מה לא תחוס
עינך (דב' י"ט כ"א) האמור להלן ממון אף כאן ממון זו היא בשת האמורה
בתורה: ד"א ושלחה ידה והחזיקה במבו', ברודף אחר
חבירו להרגו הכת' מדבר שמצוה להצילו בנפשו: במבושיו, אין לי
אלא מבושיו מנין לרבות כל דבר שיש בו סכנת נפשות מה מבושיו מיוחד דבר
25 שיש בו סכנת נפשות והרי הוא בקצות את כפה כך כל דבר שיש בו סכנת
נפשות הרי הוא בקצות את כפה: וקצות את כפה, מלמד שאתה
חייב להצילה בכפה: מנ' אם אין אתה יכול להציל אותה בכפה הצילה
בנפשה ת"ל לא תחוס עיניך:

(יג.) לא יהיה לך בכיס' אבן ואבן, למה נא' לפי שהוא
אומ' אבן שלמה וצדק יהיה לך מצות עשה, מצוה בלא תעשה

1 כיצד וכו' עד ואין הסדר מעכב, מ"ת, רמב"ם ה' יבוס פ"ד ה"ט,
ועיין בהערת ר' דוד הופמאן למ"ת: דר' שמעון אומר וכו' עד בית
חלוץ הנעל, מ"ת, ושם בשם ר' שמעון בן אלעזר: 10 למה נאמר וכו' עד
הפרשה, מ"ת: 12 פרט וכו' עד אחוה, ספרי ומ"ת: 13 עד שתהא
וכו' עד כשמועו, מ"ת: 18 לפי וכו' עד את הבשת, מ"ת: 20 מה
וכו' עד בתורה, מ"ת ועיין בספרי: 22 ד"א וכו' עד בנפשו, מ"ת:
23 אין לי אלא וכו' עד הרי היא בקצות את כפה, מ"ת ועיין בספרי:
26 מלמד וכו' עד ת"ל לא תחוס עיניך, ספרי ומ"ת: 29 למה נאמר
וכו' עד ת"ל לא יהיה לך בכיסך, מ"ת:

מנ' ת"ל לא יהיה לך בכיסך וכו': יכול לא יעשה לישראל וחצי
 לטרא ורביע רטלא [צ"ל לטרא] ת"ל גדולה וקטנה גדולה שהיא
 מכחשת את הקטנה: שלא יהא נוטל בגדולה ומחזיר בקטנה וכן באיפה:
 אבן של ימה, להוציא הפגומה: איפה של ימה, לא המחוק דברי
 5 רבי ישמעאל ר' עקיבה או' אף המחוק: וצדק, צדק משלך ותן לו, מכאן
 אמרו היה שוקל עין בעין נותן לו גירומין אחד מעשרה בלח ואחד מעשרים
 ביבש ובמקום שנהגו להכריע חייב להכריע לו טפח: יהיה לך, מלמד
 שמעמידין אגור אדמוס: אגור אדמוס למדות ולא אגור אדמוס לשערים: אמ'
 ר' יצחק מעמידין אגור אדמוס למדות ולשערים מפני הרמאין: אם עשית כן
 10 למען יאריכון ימיך ואם לאו למען יקצרון ימיך שדברי תורה
 נוטריקון וכך דברי תורה נדרשין מכלל לאו הין ומכלל הין לאו:
 (טז.) כי תועבת יי כל עושה אלה, אין לי אלא אלה
 שאר כל העוולים מנ' ת"ל כל עושה עול אני אקרא כל עושה עול
 ומה ת"ל כל עושה אלה להזהיר על אלו ביותר שהן גונבין דעת הבריות:
 15 אמ' ר' לוי לא יהיה לך בכיסך אם עשית כן דע שהמלכות באה
 ומתגרה באותו הדור ומה טעמיה כי תועבת יי כל עושה אלה
 ומה כת' בתריה זכור את אשר עשה לך עמלק:
 (יז.) זכור את אשר עשה לך עמלק, ר' יודן או' מה היו
 עושין של בית עמלק היו מחתכין מילותיהן של ישראל ומורקין כלפי מעלה
 20 ואומרין בוז בחרת הילך מה שבחרת עד שבא שמואל ופרעה להן
 ושיסף את אגל לפני יי ומה עשה לו] אבא בר כהנא אמ' היה מחתך בשרו
 זתים זתים ומאכילו לנעמיות: ורבנן אמרי העמיד ארבעה קונטוסין ומתחו
 עליהן והיה או' אכן סר מר המות (ש"א ט"ו ל"ב) כך מיתין את
 השרים מיתות חמורות: ר' שמואל בר איבו או' בדיני אומות העולם דנו בלא
 25 עדים ולא התראה: ר' יצחק או' סירסו דכת' כאשר שכלה נשים
 חרבך וכו' (שם ל"ג) אמו של אותו האיש: ר' לוי או' אף משה רמזה להן
 מן התורה כי ינצו וכו' וקצות את כפה וכת' בתריה זכור
 את אשר עשה לך עמלק:

1 יכול וכו' עד ומחזיר בקטנה, ספרי ומ"ת: 2 רטלא, נכך הוא
 שגור בספרי הגאונים, בהתאם למלה הערבית עיין נעאניקא ח"ב ע' 4. 4 להוציא
 וכו' עד להכריע לו טפח, מ"ת: 7 מלמד וכן, עד אגור אדמוס
 לשערים, מ"ת: אגור אדמוס, כן הגרסה בכ"י: 8 א"ר יצחק וכו', ב"ב
 פ"ט ע"א: 9 אם עשית וכו' עד ומכלל הין לאו, מ"ת: 12 אין לי
 וכו' עד דעת הבריות, מ"ת: 15 א"ר לוי וכו', פסיקתא דרב כהנא
 זכור (כ"ה ע"א): 18 ר' יודן וכו' עד סוף הענין, פסיקתא דרב כהנא שם (כ"ה
 ע"ב) בשם ר' לוי בשם ר' יוחנן: 24 ר' שמואל בר איבו או' וכו',
 עיין בהערות ר' שלמה באבער לפסיקתא שם:

ABOUT MANUSCRIPTS

MICHAEL WILENSKY, Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati, Ohio

I

A PSALM-MS. AND ITS ENTRIES

THE MS. itself, donated by Selling to the Hebrew Union College Library (No. 1), offers no difficulty concerning its nature. It was written in German square character by נפתלי הירש בן אפרים, ש"ץ of Szydlow (Little Poland), during his temporary residence at Prague, and is dated January 20, 1719.

The MS., written on vellum, bound in leather, measures about 20.6×15 cm., text—16.5×11.5 cm., and consists of 106 leaves (and two blank paper leaves), besides a decorated title-page, on which David with a harp in his hands is drawn. The folia 2–104, numbered by the scribe with Hebrew numerals (ב-קד), are occupied with the text of the Psalms.¹ Fifteen lines to a complete page, except f. 78^r and 96^r, which have an additional line in order to supply omissions (in the latter passage in consequence of a homoioteleuton). It is preceded and followed by a prayer beginning with יהי רצון, similar to the prayers found in Baer's edition of the Prayer Book (עבודת ישראל).²

The MS. is provided with vowel-points. Of the accents only סלוק (besides the usual colon between every two verses), אתנחתא,

¹ There is also another numbering by the scribe in the lower margin; f. 2 is signed as 2; f. 5 — as 3; f. 6 — as 4; f. 9 — as 5, and so on, thus f. 105, the last leaf numbered in such a manner, is signed 52 (נב).

² The slight modifications in the prayers are partly due to the mistakes of the scribe, as the omission of the word והבוחר before (!) בשירות ותושבחות and גילת ורענן instead of גילת ורנן, in the former prayer. On the other hand, the wrong punctuation אָמְרָם instead of אַמְרָם, or דודה without *mappik*, are also to be found in a Ps. MS. of the same Library, written in Presburg, 1730, by the noted calligrapher Aaron Schreiber (Herrlingen) of Gewitsch (Moravia), which is independent of the present MS.

לגומה, and פסק are given. The **אתנחתא** is sometimes written instead of another disjunctive accent, viz. **עולה ויורד**, **קטן** and **רביע גדול**, **דחי**. One time it is put instead of **פור**, viz.: **בארץ**: (58.3),³ once—of **צנור**, in **יהבך** (55.23), and once—of **רביע מגוש**, in **יהוה** (25.1), where many versions have a plain **רביע**.

The following statistical data will best give a clear conception of the frequency of the indications of other disjunctive accents in the MS. by **אתנחתא**. In Ginsburg's last ed., with which I collated the MS., 174 verses, of the 2527 which the Psalms contain, have no **אתנחתא**, of which only 65 are indicated in the MS., viz. **רביע** 42,⁴ **עולה ויורד** 10,⁵ **דחי** 10,⁶ and the three above mentioned accents. It must, however, not be inferred from this enumeration that, e. g. **רביע**, is preferred as to indication above **דחי**; the contrary is the case, for among the verses which have no **אתנחתא**, there are 111 with **רביע**, of which 42 make out about 38%, whereas such with **דחי** are only 15, of which 10 make out about 67%. When in a verse there occurs more than one disjunctive accent, sometimes the one, sometimes the other is indicated in the MS. Thus in the verses: 18.51; 42.6; 49.15, the **רביע**, not the **עולה ויורד** is indicated, even in 1.2, the word **יהוה**, having **רביע קטן**, is indicated, not the following word **חפצו** with **עולה ויורד**, though the latter has also the logical pause, whereas all the verses enumerated in note 5, except 3.3, have also **רביע**.

It would be hardly possible to find all the reasons for the

³ In Ps. ed. Baer-Delitzsch, also in the usual edd., — with **אתנחתא**; see also **גיל כי הראוי באתנה** (אגרות שר'ל, epistle 549).

⁴ Here are also included the three **אתנחתא** under: **אתה** (76.5), **גדול** (99.3), **דברך** (119.130), which are instead of **מרכא**, but since a conjunctive accent can not be indicated by a disjunctive, it is evident that the scribe meant the following words, which are all accentuated with **רביע**; see also below n. 27.

⁵ In 3.3; 30.6; 43.4; 47.10; 51.6; 55.22 (**וקרב-לבן**), where, moreover, the accent is put, by mistake, under **וקרב**, a word connected with the following by **מקף**; 124.7; 144.10; 145.21. It is true that the **אתנחתא** under **מאלף** (84.11) indicates also **עולה ויורד**, but that is probably by mistake, because the verse has a genuine **אתנחתא** so that in the MS. it has two **אתנחתא**.

⁶ In: (11.6), where, however, many MSS. have **אתנחתא**, see also Wickes **מעמי אמ"ה** (p. 36), where he agreed with these MSS.; **מען** (31.3), as preceding; **וירועך** (44.4), as preceding (the MSS. are indicated in Ginsburg's Bible ed.); 45.13; 57.9; 68.5, 36; 106.37; 119.46; 146.10. All these verses, except 106.37, have also other disjunctive accents.

indication of an accent in some passages, and the non-indication of the same accent in the others, even if they actually existed, since exactness was not the forte of our scribe (there are in the MS. about 70 omissions of genuine אֲתַנְחַתָּא, many omissions of לִנְרֵמָה; the punctuation is carelessly done) and because the state of the accentuation in the source of the MS. is unknown to us. One principle, however, followed in the indication of the accents, may be established. אֲתַנְחַתָּא is put only where a genuine אֲתַנְחַתָּא could be put. Therefore the first word of a verse and the last but one, where in the three poetical books there can not be an אֲתַנְחַתָּא, are never accentuated in the MS. Hence verses containing only 3 words, e. g. לִמְנַצַּח מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד, have in the MS. no accent, though לִמְנַצַּח is often accentuated with רַבִּיעַ. Similarly the רַבִּיעַ is not indicated by the אֲתַנְחַתָּא in the words where the Masorah expressly remarks that there is no אֲתַנְחַתָּא, e. g. כִּכְלָב (59.7, 15), יְרוּשָׁלַם (135.21; 137.5), נָבֵר (128.4), דִּרְכֵי (119.5), accentuated with רַבִּיעַ; in all these verses the Masorah, cited on the margins of the MS., remarks בְּלֹא אֲסִיף.

A very remarkable feature of the MS. is the separation by פֶּסֶק of two words, when the latter begins with the same letter with which the former ends, even when the former is provided with אֲתַנְחַתָּא. The rule, it is true, is given as first in the דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים, ed. Baer and Strack §28,⁷ but is not to be found in the two published lists of פֶּסֶק⁸ and is not observed in the usual versions.⁹ The פֶּסֶק is, however, not put between every two neighboring words which satisfy the above mentioned condition, as it should apparently be according to the quotation in note 7.¹⁰

⁷ It reads as follows: להפריד אות מחברתה שהיא כמוה. This § is not only in the first Rabbinic Bible, but also in a MS. dated 1496; Levita in his טֹב טַעַם (Venice, 1538, f. 21r) attributes this also to בֶּן אֲשֵׁר.

⁸ By Jacob b. Ḥayyim in the Masorah Finalis of the second Rabbinic Bible, letter פ at end, and in the *Massorah*, ed. Ginsburg, vol. I, letter ט, §§ 200–223.

⁹ Wickes in his טַעְמֵי אֲמִתָּה (p. 97) writes about it: "But this rule is more neglected than observed." It is odd that Levita *l. c.* did not realize this and rejects the rules given in the דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים *l. c.* only on the ground that: מִצָּאֵתִי הָרַבָּה וְהָרַבָּה שְׁאִינָם נִכְנָסִים בָּאַחַד מִחֲמֵשֶׁה כְּלָלִים הֵם.

¹⁰ It is true that in the *op. cit.* only examples of the letters ל and מ are given but there are in all four examples.

Besides the letters: ג, ז, ט, ס, and פ, of which I found no couple of this kind, the פסק is not put between the letters: א,¹¹ ב,¹² ה,¹³ ו,¹⁴ כ,¹⁵ ע,¹⁶ and ח.¹⁷ As to the other letters of the alphabet, I found couples of ד in 4 passages, of which one is without פסק,¹⁸ of ח in 7 passages,¹⁹ of י in 153, of which 6 are without,²⁰ of ל in 51,²¹ of מ in 96, of which one is without,²² of נ in 11, of which one is without,²³ of צ in three, of which one is without,²⁴ of ק in two,²⁵

¹¹ I found 54 passages, e. g.: לא אירא (3.7; 23.4; 56.5, 12, in the two first places with מקף); לא אל (5.5); בא אל . . . בבה אליו (51.2); אירא אני (56.4); ירא את (112.1); exception: ולא אשוב (18.38) (in the printed editions — מקף).

¹² Twelve passages are noted by me: 2.4; 10.9; 17.12; 50.20; 62.10; 68.34; 74.3; 82.1; 89.23; 91.1; 101.2; *ib.* 7 (בקרוב ביחי). The strokes between ישב במארב (10.8), and לא ישוב בקרב (101.7) are no exceptions for they are לנרמה and the strokes are also put in the ed. Ginsburg and others, whereas I note here only the פסק which are omitted in the latter edition.

¹³ Nineteen passages: 3.6; 5.2; 11.2; 18.1; 25.12; 31.3; 35.26; 39.5; 42.5; מקצה הארץ (61.3; 135.7); 77.3; 90.1; 100.1; *ib.* 4; מלאה הארץ (104.24; 119.64); 118.20; *ib.* 24. Two exceptions, viz.: מקצה השמים (19.7); מלאה הארץ (33.5).

¹⁴ About two hundred passages (systematically I noted 119 such passages in the first 90 chapters, among them יבשו ויבהלו (6.11), where in the ed. Ginsburg is a פסק; I noted also accidentally 36 passages of the other chapters); twelve exceptions, viz.: 18.15; 25.1; 30.4; 34.8; 37.5; 40.17; 66.5; 68.2; 85.9; וחל (in the same verse עמו וחל, without פסק); 105.45; 145.17; *ib.* 20.

¹⁵ Eight passages: 17.6; 20.5; 30.13; 47.8; 119.162; *ib.* 172; 128.2; 143.9.

¹⁶ Twelve passages: 10.3; 37.35; 45.8; 49.6; 73.8; 74.9; 89.11; *ib.* 14; 90.11; 94.13; 109.20; 125.3; two exceptions: 18.42; 77.16.

¹⁷ Three passages: 33.7; 48.8; 60.3.

¹⁸ 49.20; 90.3; 100.5; in all the verses — מקף in ed. Ginsburg; without, in 5.7.

¹⁹ Viz.: 16.11; 18.15; 77.9, 10; 104.14; 105.28; 144.6.

²⁰ The six are: 2.4; *ib.* 12; 18.29; 41.8; 118.5; 139.10. Many of the פסק are instead of מקף in the ed. Ginsburg, e. g. in: כי יודע (1.6); מי יתן (14.7). But also in: כי יבער (2.12), without פסק, the מקף is omitted. Concerning the relation between מקף and פסק, see Buechler: *Untersuchungen . . . der Hebräischen Accente (Sitzungsberichte, etc., also separate, Vienna, 1891, p. 73)*.

²¹ As: בכל לבי (9.2; 119.10; 138.1); בכל לב (119.2, 145); in usual editions, also G.'s, with מקף. Further: משכיל לדוד (52.1; 53.1; 54.1); מאכל לחמי (102.5).

²² As: עם מתי (10.16); נזים מארצו (9.6); שמש מחית (4.7); אומרים מי (26.4), instead of מקף (21.11). The exception: מלאים מפיקים מון (144.13).

²³ In: 19.7; 23.5; 42.2; 47.3; 49.9; *ib.* 21 (former word with אנתחא); 50.14; 102.17; 107.11; 119.129; the exception, in 18.48.

²⁴ In: 63.2; 107.35; the exception, in 48.11.

²⁵ In: 129.4; 142.2.

of ר in 13,²⁶ of ש in 8.²⁷ The figures cited are proof that, on the whole, chance is excluded and that we have here to do with a systematic setting of פסק, but as to single letters, it is sometimes doubtful.²⁸ It seems that the separation by פסק sometimes takes place also if the letters are not equal, but only similar, e. g. between *samek* and *sin*,²⁹ *šin* and *sin*,³⁰ *sin* and *šin*,³¹ perhaps ק and כ.³² The third rule of the דקדוקי הטעמים seems to be observed more often.³³ There are many פסק the reason for which is not quite apparent. Of the eight times in which the couple שם יהוה occurs, five are separated³⁴; but of the seven times in which

²⁶ In: 25.6; 30.6; 31.8; 60.10; 68.28; 76.4; *ib.* 13; 81.8; 107.39; 108.10; 119.86; 141.4 (the פסק is, however, omitted only in ed. G., following the reading of בן נפתלי, but exists in the usual editions); 148.8; in usual edd., also in ed. G.,—אנתחתא under the former word in the last verse.

²⁷ In: 27.4; 34.15; 37.37; 41.10; 80.10; 81.4; 96.1; 107.9. — I notice here that in Ps. 5.5, the פסק in the MS. is not put between רשע and אהה, but wrongly between חפץ and רשע; see above, the notes 4 and 5.

²⁸ To the kinship between this procedure in writing and the pronunciation of such words required in Berakot 15b (שיתן רייו בין הרבקים), attention is drawn by Graetz in his article "Massoretische Studie" (*Monatsschrift*, 1882, p. 394, n. 2). — The latter assumes there (p. 391, n. 2) that the insertion of *dageš* in the initial letter of the latter word of two words related as above, to be found in many MSS. (see, e. g. Ginsburg's *Introduction*, p. 116 ff.), was originally limited to cases where the two words were connected by מקף, i. e. where separation by פסק is not permitted, and that only the ignorance of the scribes made this rule a general one. If this assumption is true, there were two schools: one having put the *dageš* in the case of מקף, and the other having supplanted the מקף by פסק.

²⁹ In: חמס שנאוני (25.19) and חמס שנאה (11.5).

³⁰ In: לשמש שם (19.5).

³¹ In: בפרש שדי (68.15).

³² In: צדיק כחמר (92.13). There are also פסק between ב and ו, viz. in 23.6; 25.8; 50.18; 55.18; 60.2; 63.6; 85.13; 92.8; 102.5, and once between ו and ב in 90.10 (however, in Baer-Delitzsch and the usual edd.—with a stroke), but two ב or two ו are not separated, and even between these letters, the number of the separated is much less than the non-separated; one must, accordingly, seek other reasons for the separation. — It should be noted that the separation by פסק between two cited equal letters is also used in the above stated prayers of the MS.

³³ שלישית ליראה שלא יסמכו שתי חיבות . . . והם לא יתכנו להתחבר, ולא כמלה אחת לדבר; see following note.

³⁴ Viz.: 7.18; (ed. Ginsburg — מקף); 113.1, 2; 148.5, 13; not separated — 102.16, 22; 113.3.

יהוה occurs, only one time it is separated.³⁵ Of the seven times in which the word את follows the letter ם, as end letter of the preceding word, five times פסק is put before it.³⁶ Also in the single place where את is preceded by the labial ב, viz. ולא יעזב את (37.28), it is separated by פסק.³⁷ Once two words, the former of which is accentuated with אתנחתא are connected by מקף, viz.: אליך-נפשי (143.6).

Scanty Masorah parva appears in the outer margins, registering only the קרי and the exceptional readings, as the above mentioned קמץ בלא אס"ף, or פתח באס"ף etc., generally of the character of the Masorah in the Letteris Bible edition.

The MS. belongs to the group of MSS. in which a *ḥateph pataḥ* is put only under a guttural letter. Particularly a *šewa* under a consonant is not transformed into a *ḥateph pataḥ*, even when the consonant is repeated, e. g. מרבבות (3.7); הוללים (5.6); שוררי (5.9; 56.3); צוררי (6.8; 7.7; 42.11) etc. (In more than 70 words which I collated, I did not find any exception.)³⁸ Also such words as: מנחם (17.14, twice);³⁹ קרבת (73.28);⁴⁰ ברכי (103.1; 104.1, 35);⁴¹ ברכו (103.20);⁴² וקרב (55.22); לשפנים (104.18)⁴³ are with simple *šewa*.

³⁵ Viz. 124.8; not separated—20.8; 118.10–12, 26; 129.8.

³⁶ Viz. 25.22; 102.16; 140.14; 145.15; 147.12; not separated — 35.1; 137.7.

³⁷ Graetz, *op. cit.* (p. 392, n. 1) suggested that generally between מ and א separation takes place; his examples, however, are taken from the other Bible books, according to the usual readings.

³⁸ Almost a half of the 60 MSS. described by Ginsburg in his *Introduction* belong to this group. The writing with *ḥateph pataḥ* is given in the דקדוקי השעמים and in the *Opuscules et traités d'Abou'l-Walid . . . Ibn Djanah*, ed. J. and H. Derenbourg, p. 279; in both works, however, no general rule is given, but only some examples.

³⁹ With *ḥateph pataḥ* in the text of Ginsburg's ed. of the Bible, see also מנחת שי.

⁴⁰ With *ḥateph pataḥ* in Ibn Janah's above mentioned work, p. 280; see also the note of the editor in the aforementioned Bible ed. and מנחת שי on Isa. 58.2.

⁴¹ The punctuation with *ḥateph pataḥ* is given in the respective notes of the above mentioned Bible ed.

⁴² See the above mentioned Bible ed., also *Manuel du Lecteur*, ed. Derenbourg (*Journal Asiatique*, 1870, p. 376, separate ed., p. 68).

⁴³ See the above mentioned Bible ed., also the above mentioned work of Ibn Janah, p. 280–281.

center-mark, חצי הספר, is written in the text before ויפתוהו (78.36). No inverted nuns in Ps. 107. Over the final letters of פותח את-ידיך (145.16) are arabesques, an allusion to the Cabalistic symbol חתך made up of these three letters.⁴⁹

The Psalms are arranged for the seven days of the week. Of the five books into which the Psalms are usually divided, only the second is marked, perhaps by a later hand (the division into 5 books is mentioned in the prayer after the Psalms). At the end of the Psalms, probably in order to fill out the space, the first three verses of the book, 1.1–3, are repeated.

The initial words of the chapters are written in large letters. The chapters are numbered with Hebrew numerals: א-קנ, within the text. The verses, in the margin, also with Hebrew numerals, from 5 to 5, but so that only the number א is put at the beginning of verse 1, the other numerals — at the end of the respective verse, but there are many mistakes, so that, e. g. Ps. 119 (in which each letter of the alphabet begins a new line and the initial letter of the word is large), has, according to this numbering, only 173 verses, instead of 176. At the upper margin of each page is written תהלים ליום with the addition of the respective day: ראשון, שני, and so on. Custodes run from page to page. Owing to the excessive use, many passages are obliterated.

The characteristic features of the hand writing in the MS. are the following: 1) Raphe over כפ"ת בג"ד, but not over א or ה silent,⁵⁰ 2) the left shaft of the ה is short, 3) the left vertical

מלמעלה ומלמטה חוץ מן זו שלא נקוד אלא מלמטה . . . or מלמעלה ומלמטה are a later addition. They do not occur in the oldest recension of this Rubric which is contained in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, nor in the best MSS." See also the Commentary of Rashi on this verse.

⁴⁹ Hayyim Vital writes, in his פרי עץ חיים (שער עולם היצירה) §5, f. 36, col. 2, Dubrowna, 1803): תכונן לשם חתך והוא שם קדוש ונורא (ובסופי חיבות M. W. ונק' שם הפרנס' בין המקובלים

⁵⁰ Many of the readers would certainly find it improper that the Raphe-sign is here counted among the outer features of the MS. Indeed one gets used, following the opinion of Ch. D. Ginsburg, to see in this sign an ingredient of the tradition. The latter writes in his *Introduction* (p. 114): "In all Massoretic MSS. of all schools, whether Spanish, Italian, Franco-Italian, or German, not only are the aspirated letters (כפת בג"ד), uniformly denoted by *Raphe*, but the silent *Aleph* . . . and the *He* . . . are duly marked with the horizontal

The question whether this MS. is copied from another MS. or from a printed edition, one has with great probability to decide in favor of the former assumption. The Masoretic remarks in the MS. differ from those, e. g., in the Rabbinic Bible; so, to מלרע — (17.3) ומתי (כתתי' ה' there במקום א — (9.21) מורה (there מלעיל ויתר י' — (21.2) יגיל (there only יוד — (37.15) וקשתותם (there, not only no remark, but the ש is without *dageš*);⁵¹ to יפלו (45.6) שוא באתנח (there no remark); to ביקרותיך (*ib.* 10) — (there no remark); to ק' רגושה (*ib.* 14) כבורה (there no remark); to מעוון (52.9) רגש בז' the ז is, however, without *dageš*, (there no remark, but the ז is with *dageš*); to עוזה (68.29) — (there no remark); to דגש אחר שורק (78.63) הוללו (there no remark); to שועתי (88.14) — see above p. 565, (there no remark, but also with *patah*); to מלך (93.1) דגש אחר — (94.21) יגודו (there no remark); to כולו קמץ — (93.1) 'ול' (there דגש אחח שורק — (102.5) הוכה (there 'ל' ומלא חולם

⁵¹ That the שין is with *dageš* is expressly said by Ibn Janah in his ספר הרקמה (ed. Wilensky, p. רנו, l. 23).

יחוגו to; (ל' וחד שפנים there השין רפה — (104.18) לשפנים to; (מלא (107.27) — דגש אחר חולם (there no remark, see above 94.21); to ולא (127.2) — א במקום ה (there 'ל' וכתי' ה; see above 9.21); to (139.16), no remark (there 'ולו ק'). The *pasek*s are here more frequent, see above. More decisive evidence that it is copied (or at least that the Masoretic remarks are copied) from another MS. is in the two Masoretic remarks to: ואדנינו (135.5) and לאדני (136.3) — נעה, which yields no sense, but is easily explained, if we assume that it is copied from a MS. in which the ה did not differ or differed little from ה, as is the case, e. g. in the "Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus," edited in photographic facsimile by Strack in 1876, containing the Latter Prophets, and many others;⁵² the meaning is thus נעה, and agrees with the usual Masoretic remark: בלישוא 'מפקין א', i. e. that the א of אדון is *pronounced* in seven passages after a prefix.

We saw that this MS., despite its recent date and carelessness of the scribe, conserved many old and good readings. In the following we will see that its entries include an important historical datum which is, however, not so evident.

On the title-page is written: ספר תהלים מסודר על כל ימי השבוע; והאומרו בכל יום מובטח שהוא בן עולם הבא (below (in Rashi-writing): אני הכותב נפתלי הירש ש"ץ משידלוב לעת ע' (עתה) בק"ק פראג ש' תע"ט חזק חם ונשלם זה הספר תהלים שבח: ל"ק (!); at the end of the text: לא' בור' עולם נכתב וננמר היום יום ו' ד"ט בחדש טבת תע"ט לפ"ק.

The Colophon of the scribe is written at the end of the MS. (p. 106^v), and reads as follows: זה מעשה ידי להתפאר בעזרת השם י' נאי (!) הם הקטן נפתלי הירש בלא"א כהרר אפרים זצ"ל ש"ץ משידלוב (!) לעת עתה בק"ק פראג דהיינו בשתי בתי כנסיות ב"ה (בית המדרש M. W. חדש וב"ה חצר גדול (!) לפרט נפתלי אילה שלחה דציבורא לפ"ק.

⁵² E. g. in the famous Codex Or. 4445, described by Ginsburg in his *Introduction* as No. 1 (see p. 473, and Margoliouth, *Cat. Brit. Mus.*, part I, plate I), the Cod. Harley 5720, the MS. described by Dr. Blank (*HUCA*, vol. VIII-IX, p. 236 — see the facsimile, *ib.*, p. 235), the above mentioned Pentateuch-Codex and a MS. of the *שאלות דרבי אחאי* in Oriental Rabbinic of the twelfth to thirteenth century (formerly property of Halberstam then of A. Epstein), both of the HUC Library; see also Bernheimer, *Paleografia Ebraica*, p. 45, alinea "He" under "quadrati" 2.

letters, the numerical value of which equals 479, are, in the MS., with an arabesque over each of them. As to the Neuschul and Grosshof synagogues, see the *JE*, s. v. "Prague," p. 158^b.

Immediately following, but with other ink, there is an entry: מאיר עיני חכמים החכמה תחיה בעליה המה שלשה שותפין בזה ספר תהלים הוא בכתובים: נדרבו מצדיקי רבים מאירים ומזהירים ככוכבים: אלו הן הקרובים: ה"ה (הלא הם M. W.) הקצינים הנדיבים כמר מאיר בן... (יעקב?) שוואב יצ"ו: וכמר מאיר בן הקצין כ' זלמן שוואב יצ"ו: וכמר מאיר בן... (הרב?) שמואל ווימפא⁵³ סג"ל נה(ת?) נו לבה"מ של א"ו (אביהם זקנם M. W.) המנוח מו' [רנן] אברהם שוואב זצ"ל יום ב' כך ננילה במנחם תיו עיין טי"ת לפק מאירים is a hint at the three owners of the MS., whose names were מאיר. Over במנחם is the same sign as over מאירים, here in order to point out that the word designates a month, namely Ab. The missing words are partly erased and partly very faint.

Accordingly the scribe who wrote the MS. for stock, finished it in January 1719 and sold it only in August of that year. At first sight it seems that the sale also took place in Prague, because another location is not indicated in the Colophon. A closer scrutiny, however, shows us the contrary. On the one hand, we know that the abode of the scribe in Prague was only temporary (לעת עתה בק"ק פראג); on the other hand, we are forced in any case to admit a change of the MS. to another locality: in a later time, at least, it was certainly in Metz, without this circumstance being noted in the MS. On the verso of the title page is, namely, an entry in German cursive bad writing, which partly has become very faint:

אני כתבתי את זאת (!) היו' יו' ג' כ"ד אלול תקי(?) א' לפ"ק מפני טרדות	
אקדצר (!) אקצר	ר' מאיר שרליוויל
	ר' אנשיל אונדיך
	ר' זנוויל האמבארנ
	ר' אהרון וורמש (?)
	ר' זלגמאן זי"א

⁵³ Wimpfen, town in Germany. For the reading of this very faint word I am indebted to Mr. Moses Marx.

אלו היראים וחכמים לומדים בבית המדרש דקלום אשר הקים ר' אברהם גרומביך
וצ"ל כאן בק"ק מעץ

גם (the word is very faint) הבוחרים (הבחורים?) לומדים שם בחדר
ר' מאיר שרליוויל ובחדר ר' זעלמן זי"א ובחדר

Here the entry breaks off.

The alienation of a Psalms MS., belonging to a synagogue, would be in itself a strange thing. What is more, too, that the alleged new owner of the MS., the synagogue of Metz had also a sponsor bearing the forename אברהם. All the difficulties disappear if the synagogue in the Colophon is identical with the synagogue — Claus in the entry, i. e., that the MS. was sold in Metz. The difference of the family names — here Schwab, there Grumbich — is no contradiction to our supposition, as it seems, but a support for it. The above copied entry, although an awkward scribble, teaches us that the synagogue under question was also a study-house, a Claus, at which the five persons, the names of whom are there listed, were teachers. This is, therefore, nothing else than the Claus-Yeshibah at Metz (which, after some transformations, became the Rabbinical Seminary, at first in the same city and since 1859 in Paris),⁵⁴ the building for which and a guaranteed generous yearly sum in support of it were donated by Abraham b. Meir Schwab and his wife Agatha (יאכ"ט) January 23, 1704, shortly before the death of the former,⁵⁵ persons known also to us as parents-in-law of a daughter of Glueckel of Hameln.⁵⁶ But the members of this family were

⁵⁴ See Ab. Cahen: "Le Rabbinat de Metz" (*RÉJ*, vol. VIII, p. 260), also Bauer: *L'École rabbinique de France*.

⁵⁵ See his act of donation, published in the *Archives Israélites* (1844, p. 388 ff.), where also the name of A.'s father as well as the names of his four sons (see further) are given. From this document we learn also that the number five of the teachers is not an accidental one, but was established by the donor as a condition. A. died March 13, 1704, see Ginsburger: "Elie Schwab" (*RÉJ*, vol. LXIV, p. 106). Ab. Cahen's statement (*op. and l. c.*) that Gabriel Eskeles, during the rabbinate of whom the gift was made, left Metz definitely in 1703, is wrong, see Kaufmann, *Samson Wertheimer* (p. 89, n. 2).

⁵⁶ See the *Memoirs* of Glueckel (ed. Kaufmann, pp. 182, 213 et al.).

named also גרומבאך, גרומביך, and גרומב(א)ך.⁵⁷ The three men bearing the name מאיר, the buyers of the MS. were the grandsons of A. Indeed Abraham's son זלמן (שלמה), of whom we know that he died 1744, had in his turn a son משה מאיר.⁵⁸ שמואל ווימפא, the father of the other companion, is no other than the chief rabbi of Upper Alsace⁵⁹ and famous financier, son of Cerf Levy, second husband of the above Glueckel, and the wife of whom was Genendel, the learned daughter of our Abraham;⁶⁰ the third whose father's name is very faintly visible, is certainly a son of Jacob, or Reuben, other sons of A who had issue.⁶¹

It remains to say some words about the teachers of the Claus. Their family names, except האמבארנ, are wide spread especially

⁵⁷ E. g. in the document published by D. Kaufmann in the *RÉJ* (vol. XIX) he is named, p. 118, l. 12, גרומבאך (*ib.* l. 10 from bot. גרונבאך, perhaps a misprint), whereas he signs himself שוואב; Glueckel names him in her *op. cit.* קרומבאך; see also Ginsburger "Les Juifs de Metz" (*ib.*, vol. L, pp. 238–260, Nos.: 6; 23; 25; 60–61; 69). The latter bases this duplicity on the fact that the wife of Meir Schwab, the father of A., was the daughter of Raphael Grumbach (*ib.*, vol. XLIV, p. 106), but he himself in his article *ib.* in vol. L (p. 120, under 7) assumed that a certain A. Geronbache, equals Grumbach, according to him probably the father of the mentioned Meir, was also named Chouabe, equals Schwab, in the "Memorbuch" of Metz.

⁵⁸ See Ginsburger, *RÉJ* (vol. L, p. 240, No. 61) and *id. ib.* (vol. XLIV, p. 107).

⁵⁹ According to Reuss, "Alsace" (*JE*, vol. I, p. 459^b), Samuel was also chief rabbi of Lower Alsace, but see Ginsburger, "Samuel Lévy, rabbin et financier" (*RÉJ*, vol. LXV, p. 275 f.).

⁶⁰ See *Memoirs* of Glueckel (p. 313) where she names him סג"ל. Samuel was accustomed to sign himself: שמואל ווימפא, see Ginsburger: "Samuel Levy" (*Monatsschrift*, 1907, vol. LI, p. 484); in the document published by D. Kaufmann in *אוצר הספרות* (vol. III, p. 5, pagination of the article), the father of שמואל signs himself ווימפין (M. W. הרני כפרח משכבו. [כ]ם סג"ל ה(ב) [כ]ם). Genendel is the scribe of a MS., see *Memoirs* (p. 182, n. 4 of the editor); the family name Weissbach for her husband, given there, is a misprint (see *ib.*, p. XX f.). The attribute "founder of the Claus" for A. Schwab, in the same note, is not correct; it existed long before. Samuel had a son Meir, see Ginsburger *op. cit.* (p. 486). — Samuel was, however, at the time of the purchase of the MS. prisoner in Nancy, see *id.*, "Samuel Lévy, rabbin et financier" (*RÉJ*, vol. LXVI, pp. 113–117, and vol. LXVIII, p. 89 ff.).

⁶¹ See Ginsburger *RÉJ* (vol. XLIV, p. 107).

in Metz.⁶² More we know about Meir Charleville and Aaron Worms (he can be only the second). Both were distinguished personalities and teachers at the Yeshibah, the former — ראש ישיבה. Both were chief rabbis at Metz. The former was born at Metz about 1735, attended several German Yeshiboth, came home in 1755, was named chief rabbi in 1810, and died in 1812. The latter was born in 1754, studied partly at Metz, was named rabbi of Créhange, came back to Metz in 1784 or in 1785, became acting-chief rabbi in 1813 and died in 1836.⁶³ (He was the father-in-law of L. M. Lambert, the grandfather of the noted orientalist Mayer Lambert.)

The solution of the question of the identity of the mentioned personalities with those listed in the entry, depends on the reading of the third letter in the datum of the entry: ג' כ"ד א' אלול תק(?)א. There is a blot on the letter, but it can only be: 1) י, 2) מ, or 3) ס. In favor of the first reading is the fact that only in the year 1751 the 24th of Elul was actually Tuesday (in 1781, it was Friday, and in 1801 — Wednesday). If this reading is true we are compelled, according to the above imparted facts, to assume that we have here only namesakes. However, the ש of ווארמש or ווירמש is doubtful; moreover, one used also to write ווארמש, not וורמש, but the word may have been written in this manner by mistake; if it is מ, Worms is then excluded; if it is ס, both are highly probably identical with the above named personalities.

⁶² About Zey, see, e. g., Ab. Cahen (*op. cit.*, vol. VII, p. 107), Kaufmann (*op. cit.*, vol. XIX, pp. 119, 128, and 129), where it is written מניא; about this name and אונריך which equals Ennery, see Ginsburger (*op. cit.*, vol. L, p. 258, col. 3 and p. 260, col. 4).

⁶³ See Ab. Cahen (*op. cit.*, vol. XIII, p. 117 ff.) and N. Bruell (אוצר הספרות, 1887, p. 23, n. 18).

II

HAS JOSEPH B. ELIEZER HA-SEFARDI A SURNAME?

AS is well known, Joseph b. Eliezer ha-Sefardi (of the 14th century) is the author of one of the best super-commentaries on the Pentateuch-commentary of A. Ibn Ezra. An abridgment of this super-commentary was published together with two others on the same commentary by Jekutiel Lazy, Amsterdam, 1721, under the common title *מרגליות* (!) *טובה*; that of Joseph has the title, apparently already in the MS. which served as source for this edition, *אהל יוסף*. It is incomplete (see Jellinek in *כוכבי* *יצחק*, 1862, p. 33; M. Friedlaender, *Essays on the Writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra*, vol. IV, London, 1877, p. 220; and Schiller-Szinessy, *Cat. Cambridge*, No. 51). The complete work, bearing the title *צפנת פענח*, was only recently edited by D. Herzog in two volumes (I, 1911; II, 1930).

A. Geiger, one of the first in our epoch to publish anything from a MS. of the latter work, as far as I know,¹ published in his *מלא הפנים* (1840, German sect., p. 78), according to a copy made by L. Saraval, then owner of a MS. of this work (afterwards the property of the Library of the Rabbinical Seminary in Breslau), the passages of the preface to this work, omitted in the edition of Lazy. The beginning of it runs as follows: *אמר יוסף בר' אליעזר בר' יוסף טוב עלם מגלות ירושלים אשר בספרד*. Geiger adds that the same is written in the MS. Reggio of this work (now MS. of the Library of the Prussian State in Berlin, see n. 2). He writes *l. c.*: "Der Name des Vfr. lautet übrigens bei Hn. S(araval) u. bei Hn. Reggio vollständig: Josef b. Eli' eser (nicht El'asar) b. Josef Tob'elem (Bonfils)."

On the basis of Geiger's publication, or of the MS. itself, the following scholars gave J. the surname Bonfils or *טוב עלם*:

¹ G. Lippmann in his edition of the *שפה ברורה* of A. ibn Ezra (1839) cites in his commentary on it (f. 8v) one sentence from the *צפנת פענח*, MS. Munich, see the same commentary f. 5v. An author of the sixteenth century, Azariah Rossi, quotes our work in his *מאור עינים* twice (see the contents of this book, ed. Cassel), perhaps thrice (see Zunz, *חמד*, V, p. 138, or *מאור עינים*, ed. Ben-Jacob, III, p. 6).

² In the ed. Herzog (I, p. 6, l. 13) in both places, *בר*, but about the first *בר* he remarked that in the MS. Berlin the reading is *בן ר'* (see further).

Steinschneider, in his *C. B.* (p. 1456, No. 5913), where he quoted the מלא חפנים, *l. c.*; Graetz, in his *Geschichte der Juden* (vol. VI³, pp. 344 and 375, where he refers to MS. Breslau—טוב עלם, vol. VIII³, p. 23, in the text and the note—Bonfils); Zuckermann, in his Catalogue of the Library of the Rabbinical Seminary, Breslau, No. 113 (טוב עלם); Neubauer, in his Catalogue of the Bodleiana (No. 233) referring to Geiger, though in the MS. described by him the words טוב עלם are not mentioned; in the *Encycl. Jud.* (vol. IV) s. v. "Bonfils" (in the *JE* Joseph is not mentioned at all); Herzog, in his above mentioned ed. (I, p. 6, l. 13; II, p. x), and many others who followed them.

It is true, not all scholars gave Joseph a surname; even the above mentioned do not name him so throughout. Geiger, e. g. in his *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (vol. I, 1862) mentions him twice without a surname (pp. 217 and 219). Graetz, in his *op. cit.* (vol. VI³) names him so several times in the pp. following the above mentioned. Steinschneider, except in the passage mentioned, everywhere refers to him thus without a surname, i. e. in his article: "Supercommentare zu Ibn Ezra" (*Jüd. Z-t*, 1868, p. 126); in his article with the same title in פליטת סופרים of Berliner (1872, p. 44 of its German sect.); in "Jehuda Mosconi" (*Magazin*, Berliner and Hoffmann, 1876, pp. 94 and 99); in *H. B.* (1880, p. 46); in his *Hebraeische Uebersetzungen* (1893, p. 593); and in his Catalogue Berlin (II, 1897, p. 140^a). It is very striking that he omitted his surname also in the description of the MS. Reggio, above mentioned (*Cat. Berlin*, II, No. 142), where טוב עלם is, according to Geiger and Herzog, written in the preface (see above p. 573 and this page; see, however, further p. 577). So also M. Friedlaender, in his *Essays* (vol. IV, p. 219 (three times), 220, 237, and 244); Bacher, in his: *Abraham ibn Esra als Grammatiker* (1881, p. 8) and in his article "Bibelexege" (Winter and Wünsche, II, 1894, p. 329), and A. Marx, in his Hebrew article: "מן הנגידה" (ספר היובל של הדואר), New York, 1927, p. 187).

There are several possible reasons for the lack of a surname. In some cases, the omission is made without any purpose; in others it is due to the wish to be brief; sometimes it is the consequence of the absence of the surname in the sources which

the writer in question had at his disposal (e. g. Friedlaender); perhaps the one or the other has avoided intentionally mentioning it. In any case, a question as to correctness of this surname for Joseph was nowhere raised, as far as I know.

Let us investigate the facts in the case. To the writer of these lines, 11 MSS. of the *צפנת פענח* are known, which, arranged in alphabetical order, are as follows:

- 1) Berlin (formerly Reggio), Cat. Steinschneider, II, No. 142,
- 2) Bodleiana, Cat. Neubauer, No. 233,
- 3) Bodleiana, Cat. Neubauer, No. 1907,
- 4) Breslau (formerly Saraval), Cat. Zuckermann, No. 113,
- 5) Cambridge, University Library, Schiller-Szinessy, No. 51,
- 6) Cincinnati, H.U.C. Library, H.U.C. Alumna Fund (No. 1), Italian cursive writing of the sixteenth century, with expurgated places and certificates of two censors of the seventeenth century,
- 7) Firkowitsch, see Fuenn, *כנסת ישראל*, p. 489, s. v. *יוסף בר' אליעזר*,
- 8) London, Beth ha-Midrash, Cat. Neubauer, No. 3,
- 9) Munich, Cat. Steinschneider, No. 62³,
- 10) New York, Jewish Theological Seminary Library, Cat. Adler, p. 13, No. 1296,
- 11) Parma, Cat. De Rossi, No. 137
(see ed. Herzog, II, p. XLII).

The MS. Goldschmidt (formerly bookdealer in Hamburg) mentioned in Cat. Steinschneider Berlin *l. c.*, is not counted here, for it may be identical with MS. 6 or MS. 10. The MSS. 8 and 10 are defective and the passage in question is there missing. Concerning the MS. 7, Fuenn writes, *l. c.*: *בראש ספר יוסף הנקרא צפנת פענח . . . הנמצא אצל ר"א פירקאוויץ נאמר: חברו הר"ר יוסף ב"ר אליעזר ב"ר יוסף הספרדי בעיר דמשק*; it is to be assumed, that the surname is also not written in the text of the preface (see also Steinschneider *פליטת סופרים*, *l. c.*). The surname is written only in the MSS. 1 and 4, in the passage mentioned (see edition)³; in the second passage, in Joseph's preface to Exodus (ed. Herzog

³ As to the MSS. 6 and 11, about which is no information there, the original of the first was at the disposal of the writer of these lines, and Prof. U. Cassuto, Rome, sent me a photo of the first page of the second. In both the MSS. are

I, p. 181), where he also names himself, the surname is not written in the text of the ed. and the editor does not indicate in his notes any MS. in which it is. These two MSS., 1 and 4, according to readings which are common to them, stand in very close connection with each other and had a common source, therefore they may be counted as only one.⁴ If, following Steinschneider (*H. B.* 1863, p. 115, n. 1), the general assumption that the scribe of the supercommentary on Ibn Ezra's Pentateuch-commentary of שלמה בן יעיש הבהור (Neubauer, *Cat. Bodl.*, No. 232¹) who names himself בספרד אשר ירושלים אלהים אשר ירושלים is identical with our author is true,⁵ Joseph refers also there to himself without surname (see *Facsimiles* by Neubauer, Plate XXV).

It is thus highly probable that Joseph had no surname; furthermore, if he had, we would have to admit that a Spaniard had a French surname (in Spain there is no equivalent of the family name "Bonfils").

We have, however, yet to explain in what manner the mistake of טוב עלם crept into MS. 1 or its source. A closer examination shows us, that, in the MSS. 1 and 4, the words ע"ם יש"י or, according to MS. 5, ע"ם יש"ו are missing (see above p. 000, the sentence copied from מלא חפנים and Catalogue Schiller-Szinessy, No. 51 at the beginning),⁶ whereas in all other known MSS., they are written here and in the Preface to Exodus (see above). It is apparent that the scribe wrote by mistake טוב עלם instead

only the words ע"ם יש"י, and not טוב עלם. I express to Prof. Cassuto my cordial thanks for his great kindness also at this place.

⁴ It is true, Herzog assures us (*l. c.* n. 1 and 2), without indicating either source or reason, that MS. 4 is merely a copy of MS. 1. Not only does he himself note in his critical apparatus the readings of both the MSS., which would be totally superfluous, in respect to an original and a copy of it, but these readings furnish us with a proof of the contrary, see e. g. I, p. 7, n. 21; p. 12, n. 17; p. 18, n. 10; p. 36, n. 10; p. 60, n. 19, where MS. 4, the alleged copy, contains words wanting in MS. 1, the alleged source. On the other hand, Geiger, in his מלא חפנים *l. c.*, who, however, did not see them, considered them independent of each other; see, e. g., the excerpt of it above, p. 573, where he would not mention both the MSS. if he did not hold them to be independent of each other.

⁵ Friedlaender, in his *Essays* (IV, p. 240), doubts it.

⁶ It is true that in ed. Herzog (I, 6, l. 13) both are written טוב עלם ע"ם יש"י, without any remark about it by the editor, but he himself writes (II,

of ע"ם יש"י(?) (It is possible that in MS. 1 ע"ם יש"י(?) is indeed written but is unintelligible, therefore Steinschneider omitted the surname in his Catalogue Berlin, see above.) The last words are the abbreviation of על משכבו יבוא שלום ינוח or וינוח. The expression is somewhat awkward, for in the Bible, the order is the contrary: יבוא שלום ינוחו על משכבותם (Isa. 57.2). One writes it, indeed, in the form יש"י ע"ם or ע"ם יש"י (see Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 358). The change of the order is due to the desire to give meaning to the words: ע"ם יש"י, a hint at ש"ש י"ש ש"ש (Isa. 11.10). We can imagine that in some MS. it was written ע"ם יש"י (see above), an expression which was unknown to the copyist; he considered, therefore, the dash in ע"ם as a ל, and corrected the preceding word to טוב.

This tendency to form the abbreviated words, so that they have meaning even at the cost of correctness, is not unique. One finds, for instance, in many MSS. and in printed editions the abbreviation ר"ם ב"מזל, which one may read ר"ם במזל, instead of the more correct: רמב"ם ז"ל. One uses אמ"ח for the three poetical books of the Bible, e. g. in טעמי אמ"ח, instead of תהלים, איוב, משלי. The title כ"ח instead of כ"ח, equals תורתו, used in the responsa literature from the seventeenth century onwards (see, e. g., the responsa אהל יעקב by Jacob Sasportas, Nos. 64, 65), allusion to קמח or rather to קמח, which in turn awakened the association of חת תורה. Often ח"י instead of י"ח, כ"ז-ז"ך, ל"ט-ט"ל, as numerals; משה בן יעקב חגיו, מני"ח; ר' יצחק אשכנזי, אר"י.

It is highly probable that it is also the case in בד"ח לב"א, an abbreviation which occurs rather often in the colophons from the fourteenth century onwards, and which means: בריך דיהב (see Schiller-Szinessy's Catalogue, No. 47, p. 129, and Steinschneider: *Vorlesungen über d. Kunde hebräischer Hss.*, 1897, p. 47, where דיהב is a misprint,⁷ because here it is a question of a concrete fact: of the vigor which God has bestowed

XI, n. 8): . . . „dass in den meisten Hss . . . ע"ם יש"י fehlt." Both the contradictory statements are wrong.

⁷ For in *H.B.* 1874, p. 64 he himself deciphers his abbreviation in דיהב, but by Löwenstein in his "Abbreviationen" (*Berliner's Festschrift*, 1903, p. 256) and Heilpern in his הנושאים etc., (1912), דיהב seems to be a mistake.

on the copyist to perform his task, not of a customary act, as e. g. in ברוך הנותן ליעף כח, an expression also frequently occurring in colophons, the meaning of which is: blessed is He Who giveth power to the faint, generally, including the scribe. However, the translation of חילא by Steinschneider: *his vigor*, is wrong, a fact to which Berliner (*ZfHIB*, 1898, p. 59) has already called attention). Here is an ellipsis of the word רחמנא after בריך, in order that the expression should have the meaning ברח לבא, "the heart is joyful." Indeed, when the expression is written in full, the word רחמנא is often inserted; thus in: 1) Margoliouth, Catalogue, No. 234, I (דיהיב, misprint or slip of the pen), 2) *id. ib.* No. 752, p. 37^a (בן אמתיה), 3) *id. ib.* No. 756, p. 57^b, 4) De Rossi, No. 7 (see Bernheimer, *Paleografia Ebraica*, p. 286); there is written: רחמנא בעלמא דיברא טעותיה דיהב (!) ברוך; it should be די ברא ברעויה or ברעויה, 5) Brody, *Die Hss. der Prager jüdischen Gemeinde*, installment 3, p. 10, MS. 9^s. It is true that in 1) the above mentioned Catalogue of Schiller-Szinessy, No. 69, p. 225, 2) the MS. of the Library of the city of Nîmes containing the commentaries of Rashi and A. Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch, dated 1469,⁸ 3) the Cat. Neubauer-Cowley, II, No. 2866, 1, of 1677, 4) the ed. pr. of the commentary of Nahmanides, on the Pentateuch (Rome, before 1480), f. 119^v after the Book Exodus, and 5) in the Alfasi, Venice, 1521-22, vol. I, f. 311^v after Maseket יום טוב (ביצה) it occurs in full בריך דיהב etc., but it is easily explained: in the MSS., serving as basis for the mentioned works, the expression was written as an abbreviation, hence בר"ח לב"א; the copyist or the corrector, who deciphered it, could not or would not add anything of his own. However, the omission of the name of God after ברוך is usual in the post-biblical literature, especially in the blessings in which the name of the Lord is not mentioned, e. g. ברוך שפטרני, ברוך שאמר, and others, but also ברוך שבהר בהם ובמשנתם (Abot, 6). For this fact, that the omission of the name of the Lord is usual, I am indebted to Prof. Z. Diesendruck.

⁸ J. Simon: "Les Manuscrits Hébreux de la Bibliothèque de la ville de Nîmes" (*REJ*, 1881, vol. III, p. 229, under the No. 13718). The statement of Simon that the MS. is dated 1470 is wrong: it is dated 28 *Marḥeshwan* of 5230, i. e. before January of 1470.

III

AGAIN R. MOSES ROTI

AFTER I wrote my notice: "R. Moses Al-Roti" (*HUCA*, XI, p. 647), I learned that the דרכי הנקוד of Moses ha-Naḥdan¹ was edited in full in the periodical הצופה לחכמה ישראל (Budapest, 1929, p. 267) by Löwinger on the basis of four MSS.,² two of which, however, seem to be not independent of each other, (see הצופה, p. 268, alinea "II"). The sentence ומפי ר' משה רוטי — with a small addition to the words cited by Neubauer, viz. after the word דבר (Isa. 51.13) כמו ותפחד תמיד (Lam. 5.18) בו — is found in three of these MSS.; in the fourth, according to the editor the best, the whole passage, even what is in the printed editions, is missing.³ On the basis of a copy made by the Abbé Perreau, then librarian at Parma, of three Parma MSS. of דרכי הנקוד, not taken into consideration by Löwinger, viz. Nos. 314⁸, 396², 809² (Cat. De-Rossi), Nutt, in his edition of the *Two Treatises . . . by R. Jehuda Hayug* (1870, p. XII), informs us that there is mentioned, among other authorities, *Moses Roti*. Steinschneider, to whom Roti was then unknown, wrote in a note to the review of this edition (*H.B.* XI, 1871, p. 20, note): "S. XII wird über ein נקוד ספר, in „drei Hss.“ in Parma berichtet . . . worin u. a. ein Mose Roti (!) citirt sei."⁴ Owing to the great kindness of Prof. U. Cassuto, of Rome, who sent me a photo of the page of the MS. No. 396² where Roti is mentioned, I was able to verify this reading. The page contains also the addition of the ed. Löwinger.

It seems, however, highly probable that also in the ספר

¹ According to *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. XXVII, p. 487, also the Masorah Magna on Amos 4.1 and Ps. 136.3, I termed this work in my mentioned notice, p. 647, שערי הנקוד etc., but the usual title is: דרכי הנקוד etc., as is written there, p. 648.

² It is true that in the heading six MSS. are named, but see הצופה, p. 275, where the editor tells us that two of the six MSS. were not cited in the critical apparatus because it became evident that they were without scientific value.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 283 and the notes to the ll. 12 and 12-16.

⁴ Löwinger, *l. c.*, p. 269, n. 2; Prof. A. Freimann, Frankfurt-on-Main, in a letter, also called my attention to it.

responsa אדמת קדש, by משה מזרחי, Constantinople, 1742: בדפוס המדפיס הצעיר בנימין בכה"ר משה רושיני"ע.

The fact that this sentence, with its characteristic expression, (דרכי הנקוד and ספר השם) ומפי . . . נשמע demands special research. The identification of the authors of the two books is rejected with good grounds by Jacobs (*JQR*, I, 1889, p. 182) and Löwinger, *l. c.*, p. 272.

THE SERMONS OF ISAAC ARAMA

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

I

WHEN we contrast the persistent popularity of the earliest synagogal homily with the widespread disfavor encountered by the medieval sermon, we cannot escape the conviction that it is love of simplicity, rather than veneration of the old, that controls the literary taste of classical students. Surely, if substance and form determine the quality of a composition, the pulpit discourses of the representative preachers of the Middle Ages excel, both in thought and structure, the most felicitous of midrashic homilies. But fertile invention and ingenious construction cannot successfully vie for popular favor with the natural grace and forcefulness of single ideas simply expressed. The medieval sermon is too elaborate to invite the attention, and too involved to hold the interest, of the most curious reader. It has depth and variety and much noble sentiment, but its cumbersome framework and intricate content present a forbidding aspect hard to conquer.

Yet the complex nature of the products of our later preachers, however unpalatable to our modern taste, mirrors most faithfully the conditions and tasks that confronted the leaders of the Synagogue during those trying centuries. The desperate struggle for survival made life for the Jew not only a solemn but also a most complicated enterprise. The hostile environment into which his lot had been cast reduced the business of living to a ceaseless combat. To preserve himself, his life and culture, he had to forge new weapons of defence, the very raw material for which he often had to import from foreign marts. For, the forces that threatened his existence, while not entirely new, had never before reached such prolonged concentration and unmitigated virulence. Nor did he seem to retain his old-time invulnerability. The steady impact of the non-Jewish environment on his religious discipline

which hitherto had formed the surest safeguard against possible disintegration, began to show most alarming effects. Practical non-conformity became more frequent and more widespread. The revived learning of the ancient pagan world, just then in full process of filtering through the European mind, induced a closer examination of the accepted truths of his inherited faith. He began to analyze, to compare, to question. Then, too, an unregenerate Church, mercilessly bent upon the destruction of any soul that would not be saved by its prescribed methods, launched out upon its nefarious work, using persuasion, intimidation, coercion, and expulsion to make its power prevail. Thus, what with his own rooted love of imitation and natural susceptibility to new ideas and outlooks, and what with the vile machinations and brutal aggressions of an unholy Church, the Jew stood exposed to the subversive influences of an alien culture and to the unscrupulous missionary zeal of a tyrannical clergy.

To strengthen the moral fiber of the Jew; to implant in his soul an unconquerable will to live; to interpret the literature and doctrines of his people in the light of his newly-acquired knowledge; to enable him to distinguish between what was true and what was false in the teachings of pagan thinkers; to arm him against the cruel onslaughts of an intolerant Church, — this became the supreme task of the contemporaneous pulpit. Such a vast undertaking called for a variety of powers in the preacher and for a most elaborate technique in the presentation of the sermon. Assuming the multifarious functions of exegete and apologist; theologian and philosopher; teacher, interpreter, monitor; the preacher had to draw on numerous sources of knowledge, both Jewish and general, and employ diverse modes of expression. In a word, the magnitude of the task undertaken and the diversity of the materials used made for the undue complexity and elaborateness of the preacher's work. And, indeed, brevity and simplicity, which lent elegance and distinction to the early Agada, could serve but ill an age that stood in greater need of conviction and courage than the delights of literary charm.

Adjustment, apology, admonition — these, then, are the conspicuous threads that run through the web of the medieval Jewish sermon. The effort of the preacher is largely focussed on

the task of reconciling, wherever possible, the new truth with the old, of expounding and vindicating the ancient faith, and stirring the will to present action. The art of the preacher chiefly lies in so weaving his material that the biblical and rabbinical texts become the warp, and his own ideas and objectives the woof, of the homiletical fabric. This closeness of texture it is, in the main, that proves so discouraging, if not baffling, to those who would trace the diverse threads through the variegated pattern. Yet, once this initial obstacle or repugnance is overcome, the pattern thus disclosed, compact, symmetrical, colorful, could not but be viewed with delight and admiration. There is great beauty in the design and much excellence in the execution. Above all, there is an amazing comprehensiveness in the representation. The whole of Judaism, its inmost nature and accidental expressions, lies unfolded before our gaze. Indeed, the important branches of our literature, the vast library of religious thought and practice, one may find in the works of the outstanding medieval preachers, in epitome.

It was because of the loftiness of its aims and the vastness of its scope that for the synagogal preachers of subsequent generations the medieval sermon, despite its patent imperfections, became an indispensable source of instruction and inspiration. Even those of independent mind sought and found therein much of the material for their own homiletical structure. To those of more restricted capacity, it supplied form and substance, text and content. In fact, the utter lack of originality we note and deplore in so much of the old-time preaching of the latter-day pulpit, may in no small measure be due to the very richness and diversity of the homiletical materials fashioned by the masters of the Middle Ages. In the presence of such superabundance, the poor in talent and power, it would seem, could not but shrink from cultivating their own meagre resources, allowing the scanty plot of their inheritance to lie fallow that they might exploit all the more thoroughly the unbounded domains of their masters. Thus, by the potency of its influence, the medieval sermon has extended its being, so to speak, beyond the confines of its proper age, imposing its peculiar standard of belief and method of exposition on many a contemporary pulpit.

In turning our attention, therefore, to the sermons of Isaac Arama, from whose עקרת יצחק, more than from any other homiletical work of the Middle Ages, countless preachers through well-nigh half a millenium have drawn much of their thought and inspiration, we are not seeking to revive interest in a forgotten or neglected classic. To this very day, Arama may be said to persist as a living presence in many a Jewish pulpit. For homilists of the older style, his sermons are still bulging with unappropriated treasures. Hence, in entering upon the analysis of these sermons we are rather attempting to trace to their source homiletical ideas and methods still current in the synagogal preaching of our day, and to delineate a pattern of religious thought clearly stamped on the pages of the בעל עקרה and still recognized as the supreme pattern of traditional Judaism.

II

Isaac ben Moses Arama was born in northern Spain, probably in the city of Zamora, province of Leon, in the year 1420.¹ While the sources of our information concerning the details of his life are few and vague, it may be safely assumed that Arama, who as a young man presided over the Yeshiba at Zamora, received either from his father or at the local Hebrew schools an excellent talmudical training which doubtlessly paved the way for his later mastery in the various branches of Jewish literature.² It may also be assumed, in view of his later proficiency in departments of general learning,³ that his early education was not lacking in the

¹ חולדות רי"ע H. J. Pollak, עקרת יצחק vol. I, Warsaw 1904.

² His sermons abound in references to a large variety of literary works. He quotes copiously from the Talmud and the classical exegetes; from the Apocrypha (Ser. 105, p. 240); from the grammatical works of Ibn Janah (Ser. 21, p. 239), Ibn Ezra and David Kimhi (Ser. 2, p. 42); from the philosophical writings of Israeli (Ser. 3, p. 53), Crescas (Ser. 96, p. 101), Gersonides (Ser. 73, p. 26), and Albo (Ser. 80, p. 129), not to mention those of the "mighty lion," Moses Maimonides, whose *Guide* directs his steps at all times; from the *Travels* of Benjamin of Tudela (Ser. 33, p. 401); and from a host of ethical and scriptural interpreters.

³ In his sermons he makes extensive use of the *Ethics* of Aristotle. In fact, it may be said to form one of the chief pillars in his temple of ideas. Occasionally, he refers to a Commentary of his own to this important work, which

customary disciplines of the secular schools of his day. At all events, he spent his youth, as he tells us, in following the deepest longing of his soul, namely, to prepare himself thoroughly for the divine tasks of life.⁴

The first rabbinical post he filled lay in Aragon, city of Tarra-gona, on the Mediterranean coast. No sooner had he arrived there than he sought to organize a Yeshiba similar to the one he had left behind at Zamora. But his new community, heavily burdened with taxes, and unaccustomed to the sacrifice involved in the enterprise, was slow in providing the necessary means, so that the few students who had followed him to his new location soon found themselves without adequate subsistence and had to depart.⁵ Deprived of the opportunity to foster learning in the young, Arama speedily turned his attention to a task proper to his office and most suited to his native endowments. With great energy and earnestness he set out to cultivate the art of preaching. The men of his congregation, he informs us, were clamoring for pulpit instruction. Attending church services as they did, or had to do,⁶ they had learned to appreciate discourses of a

apparently never reached the stage of publication (Ser. 22, p. 245; Ser. 33, p. 395). He also refers to the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle (Ser. 10, p. 130), as well as to the celebrated commentators Averroes and Ibn Sina (יד אבשלום, Chap. 5, p. 17b). At times he quotes from Plato (Ser. 35, p. 16; Ser. 73, p. 20), discusses the theories of Alexander Aphrodisias (Ser. 6, p. 85), speaks disparagingly of Manichaeism with its doctrine of dualism (Ser. 90, p. 41), and quotes from Algazali (מבא שערים, p. 22). He also shows familiarity with the rudiments of Anatomy (Ser. 49, p. 218) as well as with those of Astronomy (Ser. 48, p. 209; מבא שערים, p. 22). It may also be of interest to note that he makes mention of a method to strengthen the memory, which he himself had devised after finding all the known methods inadequate for the purpose (Ser. 90, p. 38).

⁴ הקדמת המחבר.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ It is generally accepted, and no doubt on good authority, that from the time of the apostate Paul (Solomon) Burgensis, and due to his machinations, Jews were compelled to attend church services and hear the sermons preached (דור דור ודורשי, vol. V, p. 232). Arama, however, does not make it clear whether such attendance was voluntary or compulsory. He merely states that among the attendants there were also Jews who took delight in the utterances of the preachers (ובני ישראל באו בתוך הבאים ושמעו אמריהם כי נאמן—הקדמת המחבר). He also tells of a Christian preacher who spoke to large congregations, and to whose personal invitation some Jews responded with their presence (חכם אחר מחכמי)

controversial character. Among themselves, they often engaged in heated disputes and as often turned to the rabbi to settle some point at issue. This circumstance revealed to Arama the urgent need of discoursing from the pulpit on all questions vital to religious faith, in addition to interpreting the scriptural lesson.⁷ To be sure, this type of preaching with its dialectical and philosophical background was no stranger in the Synagogue. Fully two centuries before the rise of Arama, Jacob Anatoli was delivering discourses stocked with all the weapons of a defensive faith; and the sermons of Nissim ben Reuben Gerondi, a compatriot of an earlier century, from which Arama quotes occasionally,⁸ should have furnished sufficient warrant and stimulus for the newer mode in pulpit expression. However, the realization of a present need is a stronger incentive to action than the most illustrious example of an other day; and Arama, stirred by the challenging conditions of his new surroundings, applied himself vigorously to the task before him until he succeeded in evolving a species of homiletical discourse which, if not altogether new, superbly met the needs of his own time and profoundly influenced the style and character of Jewish preaching all through the subsequent centuries.

The first product of his early labors, though not the first to be published,⁹ was his treatise on the relation of philosophy to theology bearing the title חזון קשה—"a Grievous Vision." This little volume whose chief aim was "to stir up zeal for Torah, piety, and the service of God,"¹⁰ appeared after the publication

הגוים בתוך דבריו אשר דבר במקלות עם רב ובאזני קצת גוברין יהודאין אשר קרא לנו לשמוע (נחום בתוך דבריו אשר דבר במקלות עם רב ובאזני קצת גוברין יהודאין אשר קרא לנו לשמוע, Portal 4, p. 10). Nowhere does he speak disapprovingly of this practice, either bemoaning the perilous exposure or censuring the coercive measure, though he had the temerity to attack fundamental doctrines of the Christian church (Ibid.).

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ser. 80, p. 129.

⁹ הקדמת המחבר.

¹⁰ Ser. 92, p. 61. — In a poem written on the occasion of the completion of his work, he boldly asserts that the severe trials plaguing his generation spring from the impious exaltation of philosophy over theology, and that in the book he sends forth he smites his opponents out of his great zeal for the Lord of hosts. — חזון קשה, p. 48.

of his עקדת יצחק, and is in substance, as it may well have been in fact, a summary of the theological views underlying his sermons. On the sermons themselves, he had been working all through his stay in Tarragona and Fraga¹¹ and not until he had removed to Calatayud, the last rabbinical post he occupied in Spain, did he begin to revise them in preparation for their publication.¹² In Calatayud, it seems, he entered upon the happiest stage of his career. For it was here that, in addition to the honor paid him as a famed preacher, his hands were sufficiently strengthened to enable him to return to the love of his youth, which was to raise up many disciples and bring them nigh unto the Torah. And the Yeshiba he founded here not only afforded him the desired opportunity to implant knowledge in the young but also gave fresh impetus to his creative powers. Besides completing his chief work, the עקדת יצחק,¹³ he produced commentaries to the books of

¹¹ It seems that while rabbi of Tarragona he also ministered to the neighboring community of Fraga, although some sixty miles separated the two — והערים אשר באתי בהם בתחילה הנאה והמעונה, שרגאונה והקרובה אליה העירה ברנ'ה הקדמת המחבר —

¹² הקדמת המחבר.

¹³ The עקדת יצחק, comprising 105 Portals, each of which is a separate sermon designed for a particular Sabbath — על הדרוש ולזה ראיתי לדרוח ביאורי על הדרוש — (Ser. 52, p. 246) — opens with a Preface, mainly autobiographical in character, and is followed by an Introduction in which at the close of an elaborate homily the author makes the humble declaration that, if his arduous labors through the years have borne fruitful results, his success must be attributed solely to the devout spirit in which he faced his tasks. His efforts have been spent in the service of God. From Him he has received his strength and capacity; to Him he now directs his prayer, that nothing but the truth may be found in the pages of his book.

The work, while numbering 105 Portals, actually contains 117 individual sermons. Portal 25 is made up of two sermons, joined one to the other homiletically but standing wide apart thematically. Portal 44 is divided into three parts each of which represents, homiletically, a different structure and is tied to the other only by the threads of a common theme. Portal 16 may be described as a series of sermons, seven in number, on the major Holy Days, all held together by the initial text. In fact, Arama himself would have us so regard this Portal since, in apologizing for its excessive length, he counsels the reader to peruse each part on the special occasion for which it was designed. Portal 105 is composed of two sermons, both dealing with the last days and labors of Moses but neither in text nor in development of ideas are they related to each

Esther, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentation, and Ecclesiastes,¹⁴ and prepared a commentary to the Book of Proverbs, bearing the title of *יד אבשלום*.¹⁵

In 1492, sharing the fate of his exiled brethren, Arama left his native Spain and sought refuge in Naples, where, within a year or two, he died and received honorable burial at the hands of his only son, his companion in exile, Meir Arama.¹⁶

other. Then there are two additional sermons, neither of which is included among the Portals, the one being entitled the Introduction to the Portals and the other the Conclusion of the Portals.

¹⁴ To each of these commentaries the author affixes a brief Foreword in which he sums up the chief purpose of the biblical book. Thus, the aim of Ruth, he says, is to foster a belief in God's providence and stress the doctrine of retribution. The Song of Songs seeks to confirm our faith in the high character and destiny of Israel. The Book of Ecclesiastes, he claims, is a series of dialogues carried on between the truly pious and those lacking in true knowledge and faith. Having thus stated what he conceives to be the essential aim of the given book, he proceeds to interpret the text in the light of its central thought. In the commentary to the Book of Esther, he slightly deviates from this procedure. After defining the nature and purpose of the book, he raises a number of questions which appear to uncover contradictions in the text and incongruities in the incidents related, and forthwith sets out to resolve all difficulties by his own exposition.

¹⁵ The title of this commentary, Arama informs us, is derived from the name of his son-in-law, Solomon, augmented by the word *אב*, which is descriptive of his own fatherly relation to him, and preceded by *יד* to indicate that he after whom the book is named, as well as the author, had a "hand" in its production, since it was at the urgent request of the former that the work was undertaken. Solomon, to whose tender memory the book is dedicated, died within the month of his wedding-day (*יד אבשלום* — פתחה). Arama divides the book into three parts, interpreting the various themes of which the respective parts are composed, and indicating the significance of each verse in the development of the main thought. It is the most important of his commentaries. The Book of Proverbs with its mildly philosophical observations and sound practical wisdom seems to offer a most suitable field for the exercise of his peculiar powers and predilections.

¹⁶ Isaac Arama must have died in Naples a little before 1495, as his son Meir Arama in the introduction to his *מאיר חליות* states that in 1492 together with his father he came to Naples, and that he tarried there after his father's death until 1495, when in consequence of the earthquake of that year he departed for Turkey and landed in Salonica (*מאיר חליות*, Venice, 1590).

III

The evolution of the Jewish sermon bears striking testimony to the plastic character of the medieval Synagogue. That Judaism, a religion of law, yet contrived to maintain itself as a growing organism by the simple device of reinterpretation is too well known to require special emphasis. It is equally recognized that by employing the same method Jewish thinkers and scholars of all ages found themselves at liberty to engraft new ideas upon the ancient "Tree of Life." No unalterable rigidity, neither in the realm of law nor in the world of ideas, could ever check the natural flow of Jewish thought and principle. But what is not so generally known, or admitted, is that the religious institutions of the people, no less than the law of the scribe and the thought of the sage, were susceptible of great change. The Synagogue, it is claimed by many, with its standard liturgy and venerated traditions, was adequately armed at all times to resist the invasion of any foreign elements into its principal functions; and not until the new era of emancipation arose did the Synagogue, after a most stubborn resistance, yield in some quarters at least to the clamorous cry for change. Yet, what more startling innovation within the Synagogue could we contemplate than the virtual transformation of the Jewish sermon, a process which began, it would seem, in thirteenth-century France and reached completion in fifteenth-century Spain? For many centuries, from the earliest days all through the Gaonic period, the Jewish sermon, while at no time of static character, retained its unique status as a pure product of synagogal life. It arose in the Synagogue; it grew in conformity with the laws of its nature and in response to the vital needs of the people; it spoke to the Jew in a language understood by the Jew. To be sure, contact with alien cultures stimulated the thought and diversified the themes of our earliest preachers. The early Midrashim, rich repository of most ancient homilies, teem with non-Jewish ideas and contentions. But while absorbing some foreign terms and admitting into its discussions views of exotic origin, the most elaborate homily remained undeviatingly true to its original pattern. It was not until the Revival of Learning, in which the Jew was no mean factor, began

to stir the intellectual life of Europe, bringing to light fresh truths and novel forms of articulation, that the popular teachers of the Synagogue, too, fascinated by the new modes of thought and expression, sought to adapt the new vehicle to their own needs. Thus a new style of preaching, a style hitherto confined to the classical utterances of the ancient world, made its initial appearance in the Jewish pulpit, and with apparently little opposition or disturbance, as far as the new elements in themselves were concerned.¹⁷ Nor, when some two centuries later, as in the individual instance of Isaac Arama, acquaintance with the homiletical methods of Christian clergymen pointed the way to an improved pulpit technique, did the Jewish preacher hesitate to profit by the example of the interpreters of another faith. Not even the masses of the people, commonly depicted as the most formidable bulwark against change, frowned upon the innovation. In fact, as we have seen from Arama's own testimony, it was the people who goaded the preacher to follow the new trail.¹⁸

Obviously, not change but surrender, not imitation but submergence, was dreaded and decried by the medieval Synagogue. To learn from others without forgetting its own teachings or, better still, to defend its own truths with weapons forged by another faith, for that, it would seem, the medieval Synagogue found ample warrant in Jewish doctrine and practice. Hence, if the revolutionary changes wrought in synagogal preaching by purely external influences met with general approbation and active encouragement, it must have been that in the view of leader and people alike the new elements thus introduced promised added strength to an existing institution without altering its essential character or compromising any of its recognized functions. And, indeed, when we examine the sermons of Isaac

¹⁷ The experience of Anatoli (see "The Sermons of Jacob Anatoli," *HUCA*, vol. XI, pp. 391-424) only corroborates the view that when no religious belief or doctrine seemed imperilled, the newness of a method would not debar its use from the Synagogue. The objection to Anatoli's preaching arose from the fear, sensed by some of his own friends, that the Maimonidean method of interpretation might undermine faith in the literal truth of scriptural narrative. The opposition he encountered was thus directed against the free use of allegorical interpretation, not against scholastic preaching per se.

¹⁸ הקדמת המחבר.

Arama, which may be said to have stabilized, if not actually effected, the most important of these changes, we gain for this supposition the fullest confirmation. For Arama, according to his own confession, deliberately set out to mould his sermon, in some important features at least, after a model then current in the Christian pulpit, though not actually devised by it.¹⁹ Yet at no time did Arama venture to depart from the accepted form, not to speak of the traditional function and content, of the Jewish sermon. He enriched it, so he believed, with new elements of strength, but he would not divest it of its old-time power and appeal. He retained the old cast, even though the diverse metals he poured into it often came from foreign mines.

To Arama, as to all his predecessors in the pulpit, the chief function of Jewish preachers, and greatest privilege as well, is to admonish the people concerning their religious duties and expound to them the specific obligations each special occasion entails, thus upholding a practice deeply rooted in the communities of Israel.²⁰ But the preacher's task, Arama soon learned to recognize, extended beyond this paramount duty; it also called for a cogent and attractive presentation of Jewish ideas and beliefs, a requirement many of our teachers have been slow in apprehending.²¹ In the preacher therefore, Torah must be supplemented with wisdom, if he is to establish right views and ward off the attacks of error and of falsehood.²² For true philosophy, especially that which emanates from Aristotle's *Ethics*, harmonizes perfectly with the pure teachings of Judaism. It may well kindle its lights beside the candelabra of the Torah itself, since

¹⁹ Scholastic preaching, by which we mean the combined use of theology and philosophy in the exposition of the scriptural lesson, did not enter the Synagogue through the Church. The great representatives of the scholastic mode of thought from whom the Church derived its new homiletical style were Albert, the Great, and his celebrated pupil Thomas Aquinas, both of whom lived and worked in the thirteenth century. The great Jewish representative of this mode of thought through whom scholastic preaching made its appearance in the Synagogue was Moses Maimonides, who preceded these great churchmen by almost a full century.

²⁰ Ser. 55, p. 287.

²¹ הקדמת המחבר.

²² Ibid.

they are seen to illumine views and concepts of great ethical value.²³ Accordingly, in addition to expatiating in his sermons on the characteristic institutions and observances of Judaism, Arama undertakes to discourse on a vast variety of theological and philosophical themes the clearer understanding of which the preacher deems necessary for a sound religious outlook and the intelligent performance of the ethical obligations of life. The nature of God,²⁴ the essence of the soul,²⁵ the problem of the freedom of the will,²⁶ the doctrine of immortality,²⁷ the significance of miracles,²⁸ the mystery of prophecy,²⁹ the function of ritual law,³⁰ the relation of philosophy to theology,³¹ the concept of sin,³² the power of prayer,³³ the glory of repentance,³⁴ the meaning of spirituality,³⁵ the interdependence of the material and the spiritual,³⁶ the constitution of society and its mandates,³⁷ the place of ethics in religion,³⁸ the blessings of peace,³⁹ the role of Israel in the world,⁴⁰—all these questions most vital to a rational orientation to life, Arama discusses with much profundity and warmth of feeling, not as essayist in search of a solution to the riddle of life but as interpreter of the Word bent on the fuller elucidation of scriptural truth. He analyzes ideas of deeply philosophical import, he weighs theoretical views advanced by Jewish and non-Jewish thinkers, he argues vehemently and quotes copiously, all that he may buttress a thought whose light is sufficiently strong to dispel the mists hovering over the text, thus disclosing a biblical or rabbinical truth of great spiritual worth.

²³ Ibid.²⁵ Ser. 6.²⁶ Ser. 3, 22, 36, 93, 103.²⁸ Ser. 13, 15.²⁹ Ser. 19, 25, 29, 35.³¹ Ser. 27.³² Ser. 40, 86.³⁴ Ser. 100.³⁵ Ser. 71, 92, 101.³⁷ Ser. 8, 12, 43.³⁸ Ser. 39, 62.³⁹ Ser. 74, 81.⁴⁰ Ser. 31, 66, 84, 88.²⁴ Ser. 1, 4, 21, 38, 54, 56, 87.²⁷ Ser. 64.³⁰ Ser. 60.³³ Ser. 58.³⁶ Ser. 85, 91.

To achieve this end without sacrificing any of the means sanctified by synagogal usage, Arama designed a framework for his sermon which while accomodating all the new elements, repudiated none of the old. The composition before us falls into two component parts, the first of which is designated by the author as דרישה, investigation, and the second as פרישה, exposition.⁴¹ In the first part, the preacher aims to examine a philosophical idea or thought in the light of which his chosen texts, the biblical and the rabbinical, with which the sermon is headed, seem to yield a profounder truth than is visible on the surface. This is the section in which the thinker, the investigator of new ideas, holds sway. With the completion of this portion of his task, the preacher turns for the nonce from the דרישה to assume the role of the expounder, not of a single text such as occupied his attention at the outset, but of a considerable part of the scriptural lesson. The פרישה, or exposition, thus deals with the whole setting, or context, from which the main text is taken. In this section, it is the scriptural commentator, the homiletical exegete, who predominates. The entire episode or general setting is closely scanned. Numerous difficulties and obscurities readily suggest themselves. The lesson of the week seems shot through with contradictions and inconsistencies. These must be eliminated, if popular instruction in the Scriptures is to consist of more than the mere interpretation of a single, isolated text. And as the preacher proceeds with the exposition of the whole passage so as to remove the difficulties raised, we discover that the central thought of the דרישה, which made the main text luminous and significant, also holds a solution for many of the questions presented in the פרישה. The gap between the דרישה and the פרישה, which at the first glance appeared wide and unbridgeable, is thus skillfully closed. The two distinct parts of the sermon, the "investigation" of new ideas, imposed by the conditions of the day, and the "exposition" of the book of the Lord, enjoined by immemorial custom, thus meet and merge into one harmonious whole.

In the "investigation" Arama stands forth as the thinker in

⁴¹ הקדמת המחבר.

the pulpit, the most profound expounder of religious truth within the medieval Synagogue. To be sure, he was no philosopher in the technical sense, no abstract metaphysician pursuing blithely the slender intimations of a subtle ratiocination. He was a Jewish theologian irrevocably committed to a large body of transmitted truth. His principles of faith were fixed. His religious practices were clear and constant. But his mental faculties knew no bounds and would conform in the exercise of their power to no set restrictions. Thus, he roamed over large areas of human thought without the loss, or surrender, of a single conviction or habit. He repudiated none of the accepted tenets of his faith, spurned none of the recognized guides to conduct; neither would he desist from investigating, in the interest of a wider knowledge of the truth, the more complex implications of a less tenable doctrine. In a word, he relinquished none of his own possessions, but penetrated quite deeply into neighboring domains, only to return from the adventure all the more eager to preserve the boundaries of his own inheritance. Such was his temper as a thinker, a temper that held his receptive powers within prescribed limits but left his speculative faculty untrammelled. He was free to study and dissect all the aspects of a given truth, all the trends and tendencies of the thought of his day. And it was in the minute analysis of ideas, the judicious weighing of facts and reasons, the quick discernment of the flaws and fallacies hidden in some fine-spun theories, that he revealed a quality of mind not unlike that of the true philosopher.

No one can read a single one of his sermons without being impressed with the vigor of his mind and the vitality of his thought. His expression may at times lack clarity and polish, but his thought is always sturdy and significant. We need but trace the bare skeleton of his "investigation," as drawn in some of the most typical of his sermons, to realize the robust nature of his thinking. Take, for example, the twenty-first sermon, which deals with a theological theme. It opens with a brief statement of purpose. The preacher's aim in this sermon is to show how we can form an idea of God's knowledge without having to assume that it is ever incomplete or changeable. The biblical text that follows reads: "And it came to pass after these things,

that God did prove Abraham."⁴² The rabbinic text is derived from an ancient homily in which the word "test" or "prove" is identified with a similar Hebrew word signifying "banner," and the thought is expressed that God tests the righteous so that they may rise above the mass of humankind, like the flag of a ship fluttering in the air from the topmost pole, and thus justify, as well as exemplify, God's way of dealing with man.⁴³ Then the preacher proceeds with his introduction. Even as a sentient being is distinguished by its sense-perceptions, without which it cannot be said to live, so is the intelligent soul defined by its capacity for knowledge, and when there is any disparity between its potentialities and actual accomplishments, its identity is seriously impaired. Thus man's knowledge, conditioned by his capacity, is limited indeed, though it be imperative that he exhaust its possibilities to the full. As regards God's knowledge, conceded by all to be infinite even as must be His capacity, there is no unanimity of opinion among philosophers as to the real nature of its content. For the things we humans know are neither constant nor static. What is incomplete and variable could not well form part of an absolute knowledge. Hence, some philosophers express the opinion that God who is ever the same can know only the eternal, unchangeable causes from which a vast variety of particular forms perpetually flow. Others, impressed with the thought that God knows himself, the first cause, contend that His knowledge must embrace the entire endless chain of cause and effect. It is apparent, though, that whatever their differences be they all share the view that God's knowledge is general, contemplating the particular only as part of a ceaseless process and not as a separate individual entity. To buttress this view with proofs derived from reason, they offer the following logical demonstrations. God, the all-perfect, so runs their argument, can dispense with a knowledge of the particular, so necessary to give fuller completeness to an imperfect being. In the second place, knowledge of the particular is valuable insofar as it impresses itself upon the mind and produces distinct images which enlarge the vision,—surely, the Infinite mind needs no such

⁴² Gen. 22.1.

⁴³ Gen. r. 55, 1.

mental stimulation. In the third place, since the particular can be grasped only by physical means with which it is intimately related, it obviously lies outside the range of the all-pervading spirit, with which it can have no affinity. In the fourth place, since the particular exists in, and is constantly affected by, time, it could not but remain foreign to a power that is known to transcend time. And, finally, the sad condition of our human society wherein no justice seems to prevail, definitely precludes the possibility of a just God knowing and guiding the life of the individual. All these arguments have, of course, been extensively dealt with in Maimuni's great work, and it is not necessary to discuss them here in detail. Suffice it to say that, cogent as they may appear, they fail to disturb our faith in a Providence that watches over our individual lives. Our powers of understanding are too weak and limited. We do not comprehend the nature of the insignificant gnat, nor the essence of the tiniest blade of grass, much less can we hope to understand the full nature of God. To us, therefore, entrenched in our Jewish faith, the implications of our text present a real difficulty. Since God's knowledge embraces every particular individual, object, or incident, of what significance could it be to us to be told that God tested Abraham?

To discover the exact meaning of our text, we must examine the various purposes for which tests are undertaken. In the main, there are three objects for which experimental tests are made. The physician, for example, experiments with a certain drug that he may learn to know its specific virtue. When, on the other hand, the nature and power of the ingredient are known to him, he administers it to his patients so that its potentialities, established in the laboratory, may find fulfillment in action and the experiment thus stand completed. Then, again, when these tests have proved successful, the physician may wish to acquaint the world with his findings, and so he stages a public demonstration in which step by step the process is repeated and the results made manifest. Now, all these operations illustrate three types of tests, differentiated one from the other by the diverse purposes for which they are conducted. And as we turn to the narrative from which our text is derived we find little difficulty in ascertaining which type is here represented. Surely, the first is inadmissible,

in view of the infinite wisdom of God. Nor is the third type wholly applicable here. The supposition that in the mind of God the trial to which Abraham was put had for its sole object the exaltation of the patriarch in the eyes of his contemporaries, is too fantastic to merit serious consideration. Our story, therefore, can comprehend only the second type. God knew, to be sure, that Abraham's capacity for sacrifice was great, but the finest potentialities unless given outer expression will remain feeble and incomplete. It was then to perfect the character of the patriarch, to complete the experiment, as it were, that "God did prove Abraham." Yet to us today, even as to the untold generations that have gone before us, this wondrous episode in the life of Abraham partakes of the nature of a public experiment, affording us, as it does, open instruction in the high virtue of sacrifice. We read the story and see Abraham exalted, like the banner of a vessel waving high in the air; and contemplating the heroic life of this exemplar of our virtues, we learn to understand and, as it is intimated in the rabbinic text, to justify God's conduct toward man.⁴⁴

And the same intellectual quality marks the "investigation" as developed in his purely ethical sermons. Typical of this class is the eighty-first sermon which, as the heading indicates, treats of peace, the highest of the virtues. The biblical text: "And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the King of Edom, etc."⁴⁵ is part of the passage in which Moses pleads with the King of Edom to permit his hosts to pass through the land in peaceful manner. The rabbinic text is taken from a homily woven around the incident related in the ensuing chapter. A similar plea, we are told, was addressed by Israel to Sihon King of the Amorites,⁴⁶ but this time it was met with the sword, and terminated in the utter defeat of those who wielded it. This narrative, observes the ancient homilist, reveals the peremptory character of peace, exacting the most persistent effort to preserve it. For though the command had been given to Israel: "Rise ye up, take your journey, and pass over the Valley of Arnon; behold I have given into thy hand Sihon the Amorite, King of Heshbon, and his land;

⁴⁴ Ser. 21, pp. 231-237.

⁴⁵ Nu. 20.14.

⁴⁶ Nu. 21.21.

begin to possess it, and contend with him in battle,"⁴⁷ yet craving and pursuing peace, Israel petitioned the King of the Amorites to open his borders for peaceful passage.⁴⁸ The "investigation" opens with the thought that the perfection of our nature seems to be the ultimate goal of Israel's Torah. When the law enjoins upon us the duty to release the enemy's ass from the burden under which it may lie prostrate, it is obviously intended to teach us that by the frequent repetition of the practice we shall succeed in eradicating from our hearts the sense of hate. Similarly, when we are urged to lend of our means to the needy with open hand and gladsome heart,⁴⁹ it must be that in the mind of the divine legislator such acts persisted in were sure to broaden our sympathies and crush in us any tendency toward churlishness. And if laws seeking to refine our attitude toward single individuals have the power to purify the soul and strengthen the character, it necessarily follows that principles of conduct involving the good of large groups of men will affect the personality to a still greater degree. Thus, in Judaism the principle of justice receives decided emphasis because it is so extensive in its scope, embracing a large variety of social relations and holding, in our pursuit or neglect of it, infinite possibilities of happiness or distress for great numbers of men. Thus, too, the mere study of Torah is given preeminence among our religious duties, because it is the means of instructing us in all the obligations of life. Now, as concerns the welfare of the entire social organism, there is no ethical law or principle that is at all comparable to peace in range of influence and power of beneficence. For peace is not just one of our virtues; it is the sum and substance of all our virtues. Its presence brings blessings untold; its absence spells social disaster and desolation. Hence, the preservation of peace is a paramount duty; and even when war becomes inevitable, the realization that peace is the only justifiable goal of all human strife should never depart from those who must engage in it. Moses, though launched upon an enterprise that could not but lead to war, always strove to compass his end by peaceful means. He never lost sight of the final

⁴⁷ Deut. 2.24.

⁴⁸ Bamidbar r. 19, 16.

⁴⁹ Deut. 15.7-10.

goal of his efforts. Peace he would pursue even amidst war-like activities. And so, too, as in the plea for peace directed to Sihon King of the Amorites, did the people of Israel never relax in their pursuit of peace—a pursuit the imperative character of which finds such vigorous and impressive presentation in the rabbinic text.⁵⁰

The minute analysis of significant ideas, for which the “investigation” is justly noted, gives to the sermons of Arama a dignity and elevation very much akin to the grandeur of sublime truth. It invests the simplest monition with nobility and solemn seriousness. Exhortation, with Arama, is never the crystallization of fervent feeling; it is always the culmination of well-reasoned albeit richly-imaginative thought. Hence, not only in those sermons which deal with a weighty theological problem or with a specific ethical principle, but also in sermons which are hortatory in character, wherein the preacher pleads for a fuller realization of the high purposes and tasks of life, we shall find the earnest and profound thinker at work. Thus, the hundred and first sermon, typical example of this group, offers us an “investigation” surpassed in thought and homiletical power by but few of his more pronounced intellectual efforts. The sermon in question takes for its biblical text the verse: “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.”⁵¹ The rabbinic text is derived from an apparently unrelated statement of the rabbis, that seven things preceded the creation of the world: the Torah, Repentance, the Garden of Eden, Gehinnom, the Throne of Glory, the Temple, and the Name of the Messiah.⁵² The preacher then sets out to study in his usual analytical fashion the concepts involved in the biblical text. Life and death are not simple terms. There is a life that is life indeed, and there is a life that is no better than death. Those who make earthly pleasures the end of existence, who live only to the flesh, may be regarded as spiritually dead though physically alive. And so, too, there is a death that is natural and inevitable and therefore good; and there is a death that is tragically unreal and therefore deplorable. The death of the body,

⁵⁰ Ser. 81, pp. 137–142.

⁵¹ Deut. 30.15.

⁵² Ned. 39b.

when the material and temporal element is severed from the spiritual and eternal, may in no sense be described as evil. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints,"⁵³ exclaims the Psalmist. It is when we wilfully destroy the soul within us, so that what originally bore the stamp of immortality is made to sink into nothingness, it is such a death that is the greatest of all evils. And this is the distinction that is so impressively drawn in the biblical text. The contrast, we note, is not between life and death, and good and evil, but between life and good, and death and evil. "Good" and "evil" may well refer to "life" and "death," respectively. Thus, what is really set before us is life, mere physical being, and the good life; and natural, beneficent death, and the death that is evil, the death of the soul. Therein lies the gravity, the true peril of the choice we are to make.

But to make this choice wisely, to be able to distinguish between the real and the spurious, between the good and the vicious, we must first of all have a clear comprehension of the supreme goal of life. Yet to know the goal without perceiving the road that will lead to it, is but to possess useless knowledge. It is equally important, once the direct road is discerned, that we learn how to get onto that road from the narrow and winding pathways into which we have strayed. Again, to cherish all the more greatly the goal itself, it is essential that we know beforehand of the benefits that will accrue to us when we reach our destination and of the losses we shall sustain when we fail to reach it. Nor is it possible to prosecute such an undertaking with any hope of success if we lack the guidance, the encouragement and inspiration of some wise and devoted counsellor. And, surely, unless supplied with all the needed equipment and provisions, we dare not enter upon such a long and arduous journey. Now, in Judaism, all these steps are clearly defined and given well-known designations. The Throne of Glory symbolizes the goal of our strivings. The Torah is the path leading to that goal. Repentance is the means by which we may extricate ourselves from the labyrinthine wilderness in which we aimlessly wander

⁵³ Ps. 116.15.

and come at last upon the broad highway. The Garden of Eden stands for the good that will be ours when we attain our goal, just as Gehinnom signifies the evil that will befall us if we miss the goal. The *Name* of the Messiah clearly embodies the thought of helpful counsel and vigorous stimulation, such as may come from any inspired leader of the people. And the Temple, for long the source of material blessings as well as the center of spiritual strength, represents the equipment, the necessary provisions of the pilgrim as he trudges on his way toward the far-off goal. Hence the significance of the rabbinic statement. The Throne of Glory, the Torah, Repentance, the Garden of Eden, Gehinnom, the Name of the Messiah, and the Temple,—these seven things preceded the creation of the world, that is to say, *these* must take precedence in any scheme of creation, since in *them* we find the underlying causes and purposes of all creation.⁵⁴

The “investigation” is followed by the “exposition,” in which not the text but the context, the whole setting of the text, is closely scrutinized and its exegetical difficulties and discrepancies carefully adjusted. Arama seems to have sensed the inadequacy of the current practice to isolate a single verse from the scriptural lesson and make the whole sermon hinge on it. The persistency with which he pursued the method of broadening the base of his sermon, making it embrace besides the main text a sizable portion of the assigned weekly lesson as read during the synagogal service, would indicate a definite reluctance on his part to approve, much less to adopt, the prevalent, diminutive framework. To be sure, preaching in the Synagogue had never been restricted to the initial text. At an early stage in the evolution of the Jewish sermon, the very introduction to the preacher’s homily was made to consist of the interpretation of an extraneous biblical verse which in skilful hands led directly and inevitably to the penta-teuchal text. Nor did the body of the homily ever lack the authoritative support which, to Jewish preachers of all ages, could come only from the cumulative evidence of scriptural truth. But while the single-text homily, barring perhaps the very first stage in the sermon’s growth, had never obtained full vogue within the

⁵⁴ Ser. 101, pp. 172–178.

Synagogue, none before the days of Arama had deliberately and consistently sought to include a large segment of the pericope within the homiletical structure of the weekly sermon. The "exposition" as conceived and developed by Arama, is a unique creation; and, forming an integral part of almost all of his sermons, may be given equal rank, in importance and influence, with the "investigation." The "exposition" proves Arama a great homiletical exegete, even as the "investigation" proclaims him a profound homiletical thinker.

In his exegesis, Arama follows a well-defined theory. The literal meaning of a scriptural verse, when the sense is complete, cannot be superceded by the broader homiletical interpretation put upon it; the latter is meant to supplement, not to supplant, the former.⁵⁵ To speak of the soul, for example, is not to overlook the body; and to stress a spiritual connotation discovered in a given biblical narrative, therefore, is not to ignore any law or custom implicit in its plain meaning.⁵⁶ Properly speaking, there is no conflict between the specific application of a scriptural statement, even if it be one of law, and its broader interpretation in terms of the spirit. "True, these prescriptions are of divine origin and indubitably true, and as regards their enforcement in practical life we must abide by the exposition of our sages. None the less, for speculative purposes, we cannot refrain from probing deeper into these four categories into which Scripture divides them."⁵⁷ For the Torah, be it never forgotten, even when dealing with matters pertaining to practical life in the most concrete manner, is never wholly free from diverse hints and implications of a deeply spiritual nature.⁵⁸ Hence, while accepting wherever possible the construction put upon a biblical verse or passage by the interpreters of past centuries, Arama frequently avows the intention never to desist from carrying forward his own search and speculation in the interest of a wider knowledge of the truth.⁵⁹ "In this exposition," he explains on one occasion, "I have been guided by my own views. I have sought to furnish it with strong

⁵⁵ Ser. 7, p. 94; Ser. 16, p. 184.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ser. 73, p. 27.

⁵⁸ Ser. 97, p. 110.

⁵⁹ Ser. 31, p. 379; Ser. 78, p. 99.

support, since the exposition of our early interpreters fails to satisfy me. Of course, I may have been unable to plumb the full depth of their meaning."⁶⁰ "This is the interpretation," he declares on another occasion, "that seems most reasonable to me, its only defect being that it fails to coincide with the views of our ancient expounders. Yet, have they not themselves taught us that the words of Scripture are susceptible of a great variety of interpretations?"⁶¹

This rational basis for a broader exegesis enabled Arama to pursue an independent course in determining both the significance and larger import of a given text. While the plain meaning of the scriptural lesson could never be spurned, it had always to be deepened and refined so that its inner worth and beauty might capture the imagination and exalt the spirit of the people. To meet this essential need of the edifying preacher, Arama naturally sought, and quite readily found, authoritative sanction for the method he meant to pursue. And it is because in the untrammelled freedom of interpretation Arama had gained for himself we but rarely discover any tendency toward textual distortion, wildness of fancy, or dialectical extravagance, that even today we hail him as undisputed master in the art of homiletical exegesis.

While in expounding the scriptural lesson Arama frequently employs the allegorical method of interpretation, as we shall have occasion to note in fuller detail, the large bulk of his exegetical material is derived from the simple analysis of the text as given, though not always as commonly understood. The text itself, in its most literal meaning, contains a deeper truth than is seen on the surface. Sometimes, all that is necessary is to read imaginatively a single word or phrase in a given passage. Take, for example, the biblical statement: "If thou seek her as silver, and search for her as for hidden treasures; then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God."⁶² The emphatic words here are "seek her as silver," and may of course imply no more than intensity of search; in which case the thought that the fear and knowledge of God may be compassed, by

⁶⁰ Ser. 10, p. 130.

⁶¹ Ser. 13, p. 164.

⁶² Prov. 2.4-5.

intense determination and effort, with the speed and certainty and satisfaction of the laborious acquisition of material riches, leaves much to be desired. The knowledge of God presupposes no such circumscribed quest, however arduously prosecuted. Nor is the righteous life, which flows from it, ever finished or complete. However, the phrase in question may be construed as expressive not of the intensity of pursuit but of the avidity of possession. It is only when spiritual attainment leaves one as unsatisfied, as eager for still greater conquests, as is the seeker after tangible wealth, whose greed knows no bounds, that true wisdom and piety may crown life's efforts.⁶³ Or, consider the simple similes of the Psalmist when, in contrasting the wicked with the righteous, he likens the former to the grass and the latter to the palm-tree. "When the wicked spring up as the grass . . . the righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree."⁶⁴ The Psalmist is not indulging here in rhetorical tricks, in pretty figures of speech. He is rather depicting in most vivid colors the essential qualities, the distinguishing characteristics, of the two divergent types. The palm-tree bodies forth stability and beauty; the grass of the field typifies frailty and fleeting charm. The palm-tree stands for unity amidst diversity: one common root, one unified stem, from which many branches and numerous leaves grow and unfold. However varied in their qualities and accomplishments, the righteous, too, impelled by a single purpose and beckoned by a common goal, coalesce and act as a united body. The wicked, on the other hand, being like blades of grass, each growing out of its own root, lack the power of cohesion and therefore give no promise of permanence. Again, it is in the nature of grass to grow in indiscriminate profusion, covering with verdure all places, high and low, conspicuous and obscure, thus bespeaking for it neither enduring strength nor increasing fruitfulness. The palm-tree, on the other hand, strikes root with singular fastidiousness, selecting the soil most conducive to its growth and the place most suitable for the display of its manifold charms, thus bidding fair to last and yield satisfying fruit. And so, too, with the righteous, "planted in the House of the Lord, they shall

⁶³ Ser. 68, p. 193.

⁶⁴ Ps. 92.8, 13.

flourish in the courts of our God."⁶⁵ Or, to cite one more example of this species of textual interpretation, take the charge to Gideon to test the fitness of his warriors by the manner in which they drink of the water: "Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise every one that boweth down upon his knees to drink."⁶⁶ Only those who lapped of the water, we are informed, three hundred in number, were selected, while the rest of the people who bowed down upon their knees to drink were disqualified for the service. And the reason for it, says Arama, is not far to seek. The true soldier in the army of the Lord must be one who has learned to exercise restraint and moderation in the enjoyment of earthly pleasures, lapping, as it were, by putting his hand to the mouth, thus quenching his thirst without any loss of dignity and self-respect. Those, however, who bow down to their desires, who fall upon their knees at every gust of passion, that they may drink their fill of sensuous delights, exhibit neither the temper nor the discipline of the true man of valor.⁶⁷

This simple exegesis, while extensively used by Arama and quite characteristic of his homiletical method, gives but an incomplete picture of the more striking peculiarities of his style. His philosophical bent, which he exercised with much freedom in the "investigation," makes itself felt also in the "exposition." Generally, it is some difficulty or obscurity in the text, an evident pleonasm or seeming vagueness, that challenges the critical acumen of the preacher. The scriptural verse, for example, which reads: "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed,"⁶⁸ requires special clarification and interpretation. Aside from the obvious redundancy of the clause: "that thou mayest live," there is the more vexing problem concerning the insistence to "choose life." We may *will* to live the life herein implied, but we cannot *choose* to live it, as is well pointed out in the *Ethics*

⁶⁵ Ser. 39, p. 85.

⁶⁶ Jud. 7.5.

⁶⁷ Ser. 97, p. 112.

⁶⁸ Deut. 30.19.

of Aristotle. Only what subserves the attainment of an absolute goal is subject to choice, since the ways leading to it may be many and various; what constitutes an ultimate end is unique and cannot therefore be espoused by a process of selection but by a single act of the will. However, to surmount these difficulties, it is necessary to remember that while life in its highest connotation is singular and supreme, in its relation to human thought and conduct it may be comprehended under a variety of aspects. There is a life lived for the sake of material accumulation, and there is a life lived for sheer physical pleasure. There is also the life lived for truth and goodness. Thus we speak of the life of the rich, the life of the pleasure-loving, and the life of the righteous. Now, all these are specific types of life, in respect to which one may be said to exercise his freedom of choice. Herein lies the signification of the divine admonition: "Choose life, that thou mayest live,"—select for thy life-long discipline that pattern of life which shall prepare thee for the one true life, the life everlasting.⁶⁹ Again, to illustrate further the same method, the biblical passage in which Moses complains of the unbearable burden laid upon him by God, bristles with a number of difficulties. It reads: "Have I conceived all this people? Have I brought them forth, that thou shouldest say unto me: carry them in thy bosom, as a nursing-father (nurse) carrieth the suckling child, unto the land which Thou didst swear unto their fathers? Whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people?"⁷⁰ Focussing closest attention on every single word of the argument, we cannot fail to detect several points of perplexity. In the first place, after the expression "conceived" the addition of "brought forth" seems to lend little force to the clear meaning of the verse and might well have been dispensed with. Nor is there any visible reason for the sudden shift from "parent," as implied in the opening lines, to "nurse," as stressed in the later figure. Besides, the last query seems to be irrelevant to the major contention. If it be true that Moses, the plaintiff in the case, bears no responsibility toward the people whom he is commanded to serve, then it matters little whether he be in a position to supply their wants

⁶⁹ Ser. 101, p. 176.

⁷⁰ Nu. 11.12-13.

or not. It is evident that the passage as read is in need of a more minute analysis of its basic ideas. And when we examine closely the obligation to care for the physical needs of others, we discover three possible motives or forces that impel us thereto. It may be that we are actuated by a sense of duty, a rational urge to help, such as must spring up within us when we contemplate the distress of our neighbors, of our relatives, and especially of those who owe their very being to us. We only follow the dictates of reason when we extend a helping hand to those whose lives are bound up with our own, and may even have sprung from ours. Then, again, it may be that something stronger than reason or ethical compulsion is the motive-power of our benevolent deeds. When, for example, we tenderly nurture our own tiny offspring we do so as instinctively as when the beast of the field tends to its young. And, finally, the obligation in question may have been voluntarily assumed, for a term and compensation specified in a definite contract, in which case neither reason nor instinct, but personal pledge, contractual agreement, constitutes the constraining power. Now, Moses, in stating his case, endeavors to demonstrate his complete exemption from any responsibility toward Israel. "Have I conceived all this people?"—Is their life in any way linked with mine? Have I been instrumental in placing them where they are? What rational motive or moral force is there to impel me to the task imposed on me? Nor should it be expected that I would be drawn to them by some dumb parental instinct. For, "have I brought them forth?" Of course, it may be argued that I have personally obligated myself to minister to the people's needs when I accepted the charge to lead them. In other words, I must carry them even as a hired nurse carries the sucking child, out of a sense of contractual obligation. In this case, **כִּי תֹאמַר אֵלַי**, "if thou shouldst say (this) unto me," then I may counter the contention with the simple claim that no contract can be held as valid and binding when either of the contracting parties finds it impossible to comply with its terms. And, indeed, "whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people?"⁷¹

⁷¹ Ser. 75, p. 48.

Yet it is not always textual difficulties that form the background of Arama's homiletical exegesis. Not infrequently what perturbs the preacher is the biblical thought itself which, though clear in conception and forthright in expression, fails to strike conviction in the intelligent reader. In conformity, therefore, with the well-known method used by the earliest of rabbinic interpreters, Arama employs his exegetical skill to mitigate, if not always to eliminate, the harshness of scriptural ideas which appear otherwise untenable and at times even repugnant. The device, though ingenious, is too familiar to startle. It consists of the studied attempt to read into the text a more acceptable, a more noble, thought than is conveyed by its plain meaning. Thus, the bold and baffling assertion that "The Lord is a man of war,"⁷² leads Arama to expound his favorite thesis that divine providence is not only general, as some thinkers would have us believe, but individual as well, embracing, to be sure, mankind as a whole, but not excluding the most insignificant member of the race. The great military leader, while chiefly concerned with the condition and conduct of the entire army, is keenly interested in the welfare of every single soldier under his command. Understood in this sense, the declaration that God is a military chief rises to great spiritual significance.⁷³ Again, God's promise immediately after the Flood not to cause the earth to be swept again by such waves of destruction, contains a reason for the resolve not altogether in harmony with our exalted view of human nature. Hence, the divine pronouncement: "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth,"⁷⁴ the preacher strives to reread in the light of his own conception of man's nature and destiny. What we find in this verse, says Arama, is not a derogatory estimate of human nature as it stands revealed today, but rather a most unexpected tribute to man's nature since its emergence from the purifying waters of the primeval flood. For the term "man" is used here generically, meaning mankind, and "youth" therefore has reference to the early history of the race. The statement

⁷² Ex. 15.3.

⁷³ Ser. 40, p. 97.

⁷⁴ Gen. 8.21.

thus construed may well read: For the imagination of the heart of mankind is evil from its youth, that is to say, whatever of evil had entered into the soul of man had come from the early experience of the race, through the sin of Adam, which the deluge had completely washed away, thus leaving man purged, purified, transformed, altogether worthy of a happier lot than befell the generation of the Flood.⁷⁵

The homiletical exegesis of Arama, however, is not confined to the literal plane. His verbal criticism, which bulks large in the unfoldment of his sermon, frequently invades the realm of the fanciful, the symbolical, the allegorical. For it is the contention of Arama, repeatedly put forth and forcefully defended, that certain sections of the Bible, especially its narrative portions, will yield only half their meaning, and none of their deeper significance, to the casual reader or to the devotee of literalism. We cannot assume, he argues, that all the countless inconsequential details with which so many of the pages of the Bible are cumbered, conceal no greater depths of thought than they reveal.⁷⁶ Moreover, our ancient interpreters blazed a new path for us when they chose on occasion to conceive of scriptural persons and objects as emblems of ideas and experiences of a later age.⁷⁷ Accordingly, while the masses of the people may rest content with the thought of a given text in its literal rendition, the trained mind of the student will forever strive to discern in it some metaphorical representation, thus adding the "honey" of original thought to the "milk" of transmitted truth.⁷⁸ If, then, Arama often resorts to symbolism in his exposition of the scriptural lesson, it is mainly because he wishes to infuse into his sermon a richer content, one that will instruct and delight the cultivated as well as the untrained. And, indeed, by the judicious use of this very ancient method, he not seldom succeeds in investing a dull, prosaic text with much poetic beauty.

It is impressive to note, though, the measure of restraint exercised by Arama in this ordinarily unrestricted field of homiletical interpretation. To be sure, his penetrating eye never fails

⁷⁵ Ser. 14, p. 167.

⁷⁶ Ser. 25, p. 287.

⁷⁸ ש"ש, pp. 18-19.

⁷⁷ חזון קשה, Portal 11, p. 37.

to detect the slightest resemblance between seemingly disparate ideas or objects, but there is usually much aptness and reasonableness in the likeness suggested. When for instance, he discerns in the sacrificial cult a ceremonial institution emblematic of the sacrifices we must make in the effort to realize our spiritual ideals,⁷⁹ or when he envisages in the construction of the Tabernacle and in the coordination of its various parts a vast symbol of the social organism in its corporate and individual relations,⁸⁰ we cannot but sense the appropriateness of the comparison even if we incline to disrelish the elaborateness of the design. Even when addressing himself to the text: "And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became four heads,"⁸¹ he makes the four streams symbolize the four branches of human knowledge: mathematics, physics, theology and philosophy, respectively;⁸² or when commenting on the verse: "It is better to dwell in a desert land than with a contentious and fretful woman,"⁸³ he also seeks to find in it confirmation of his thought that the study of Torah which hails from the "desert land," is rather to be sought than the mastery of metaphysics whose disputatiousness is strongly reminiscent of a "contentious and fretful woman,"⁸⁴ we are struck more with the ingenuousness of the preacher than with the artificiality of the homily. Surely, when he makes the Booth, with its prescribed measurements and scanty equipment, body forth the lesson of moderation, simplicity, and inner contentment,⁸⁵ we perceive a just likeness and a delicate touch of beauty in the accomodation. Nor is his use of the allegory devoid of distinctiveness and charm. In fact, the consummate skill with which the rhetorical figure is extended and made to set forth the salient features of the inferred subject, must dissipate whatever unsavory sensations the whole strange process may induce in some readers. On the other hand, those who naturally delight in the allegorical method of presentation will be afforded in these sermons many an opportunity to

⁷⁹ Ser. 57, p. 12.

⁸⁰ Ser. 48, p. 203; Ser. 49, p. 11; Ser. 56, p. 303.

⁸¹ Gen. 2.10.

⁸² Ser. 7, p. 101; חוות קשה Portal 10, p. 29.

⁸³ Prov. 21.19.

⁸⁴ יד אבשלום, p. 69a.

⁸⁵ Ser. 67, p. 181.

indulge their special taste. If with them, as with the preacher, the superiority of theology over philosophy is a genuine conviction, they will relish their simple faith all the more keenly when Sarah is made to personify their favorite study and Hagar the philosophy of the schoolmen, thus dooming the latter to be the eternal handmaid of the former.⁸⁶ Should they, too, as no doubt did the preacher, harbor an unspeakable aversion for war and all military accounts, then the elaborate allegory in which the prescribed rules for the proper conduct of military campaigns⁸⁷ are applied in all their details to the spiritual conflicts within the individual soul, making the warrior called to the colors represent the heroic spirit battling against the evil forces within his own self,⁸⁸ will spare them the displeasure they fain would escape. For in all cases Arama strives, by means of the allegory, to give reality and vividness to some thought or spiritual state whose nature and validity may be only vaguely apprehended by the great mass of mankind.

This tendency of Arama to allegorize, while always held under admirable control and within reasonable bounds, is given somewhat freer rein in the rabbinical texts. Not that Arama ever deviates from his standard method of homiletical exegesis. His aim as expounder is always the same, not to distort the original meaning of his textual material but rather to illumine it with the light of his own knowledge and understanding, so that the theme of his sermon may gain fresh emphasis and lustre. Yet the highly fanciful statements of the old Agadists seem to suggest, in some cases even to necessitate, the use of the allegorical method. In fact, one cannot be certain that these passages, with their rich imagery and picturesque phrases, express any thought that is simple and clear. One cannot escape the conviction that many of these statements must have been intended by their original authors for allegorical interpretation. In a word, they must have written allegorically. Surely, the fantastic stories of Rabbah bar bar Hana, the interpretation of whose amazing adventures, often essayed by Isaac Arama,⁸⁹ has taxed the ingenuity of countless

⁸⁶ פ"ח, P. 11, p. 38; ו"ק, Ser. 46, p. 173.

⁸⁷ Deut. 20.

⁸⁸ Ser. 99, pp. 115, 118.

⁸⁹ Ser. 24, p. 276; Ser. 85, p. 195.

later preachers, could hardly be construed as factual statements. It is scarcely to be doubted that many an ancient preacher, even as did this Babylonian Agadist, couched his thought in metaphorical language so as to achieve a definite artistic effect. One such Agadist, for example, in true poetic fashion conjures up a picture of two angelic escorts, the one of benevolent and the other of sinister nature, following every Jew as he wends his way from the Synagogue, on the eve of the Sabbath. As they enter the home of their charge, if greeted by the customary Sabbath atmosphere, the benevolent angel with unalloyed joy invokes the benison of unbroken observance on future Sabbaths, to which the sinister angel, much against his will, responds with a lusty amen. The process is completely reversed when a week-day setting and mood greet the ethereal guests.⁹⁰ Now, in this passage, says Arama, we have a graphic portrayal of the eternal conflict within the human soul between the two forces of our nature, the good and the evil; and the thought accentuated is clearly this, that when the spirit of obedience prevails in our conduct, then the evil promptings of our nature, far from persisting in their clamorous desires, join hands with the victor for further triumphs in the future.⁹¹ This interpretation may or may not fully coincide with the intended meaning of the author, but that some such thought is contemplated in the passage can hardly be questioned. Of course, not all rabbinic statements so allegorized by the preacher present the same high degree of inevitability which is exemplified in the above illustration. Often enough the symbolic connotation, while avowedly unintended to supplant the plain and obvious meaning, is clearly superimposed, being neither natural nor necessary. But even in such cases, however artificial and incongruous the method, the thought Arama seeks to extract from the forced symbolism is always sound and impressive. To cite one example, perhaps the least defensible of the whole group, take the rabbinic statement concerning the proper disposal of the parings of finger-nails. He who scatters them hither and thither, the teacher avers, betrays an evil nature; he who hides them from sight, discloses the temper of the righteous;

⁹⁰ Šab. 119b.

⁹¹ Ser. 47, p. 190.

and he who consigns them to the flame, acts as becomes a true saint.⁹² After giving due recognition to its literal meaning and intention, Arama endeavors to extort from the passage a thought of deeper significance. Since nails, even as the talons of birds of prey, have often been used as the tools of spoliation, to grasp, to flay, to tear what others would and should have, they may be taken to symbolize the spirit of greed in the heart of man. The passage therefore deals with three divergent types of character as determined by the part greed plays in their daily conduct. The wicked man exercises his greedy nature at all times and in all places, casting its tokens, as it were, to all sides; the righteous man has learned to control it, to keep it out of sight, so to speak; it is only the saint who has conquered and destroyed it.⁹³

Thus, interpretation in its various forms constitutes the core of the "exposition," even as the minute analysis of ideas forms the essence of the "investigation." There is, however, another very important element that enters into the composition of Arama's sermon, one that is common to both of its component parts, and one, moreover, that reveals new powers in the preacher and invests his product with much literary charm. In fact, his proficiency in the art of interpretation is only matched by his mastery in the art of elucidation. It is Arama's undeviating practice, once his thought is stated and analyzed, or the construction of the text put forth and adequately supported, to fortify his thesis by means of popular illustrations; and it is in the aptness, variety, and effectiveness of these illustrations that some of the most engaging qualities of his style may be found. That his literary style stands in great need of some redemptive attribute, some saving grace, must be apparent to any reader of these sermons. There is, generally speaking, a woeful lack of lucidity of expression in his ponderous pages. Time and again, the cumbersome sentences, weighted with the metaphysical jargon and subtleties of the schoolmen, defy intelligent comprehension of propositions otherwise simple enough. Frequently, in sentences least involved, the utterance is too concise and cryptic to be

⁹² Nid. 17a.

⁹³ Ser. 97, p. 120.

intelligible.⁹⁴ While the structure of the whole is always good and the progress of ideas never halted or delayed, the individual parts are often marred by an awkwardness and haziness of expression calculated to conceal more than it reveals. Yet, and this is the most amazing of contrasts, no sooner does the preacher turn his attention away from the philosophical basis, or authoritative sanction, of his thought, and proceed to amplify the theme of the sermon, supplying sundry illustrations of its more significant implications, than a startling change comes over the spirit of his composition. The erstwhile heavy and murky prose is suddenly transformed, as if by magic, into clear, simple, graceful lines, whose lyrical quality none will mistake. The preacher doffs, as it were, the sable cloak of the metaphysician, and wraps about him the variegated drapery of the poet.

His illustrative material is derived from three main sources. The first of these comprises some striking legends and stories related in the works of secular writers, to which the preacher refers when he desires to make more vivid and impressive a specific idea or truth emphasized in the sermon. Thus, to give poignancy to the thought that fear as a motive for religious action not only vitiates the individual act performed but tends to degrade the character and ultimately to induce the commission of heinous crimes, he turns to the tragic career of Alkmaeon. According to the Greek legend, Eriphyle, the mother of Alkmaeon, plotted against the life of Amphiaraos, her husband, by inciting him to wage war against Thebes. This sinister design the warrior somehow sensed; and before launching the campaign from which, he feared, he might not escape alive, he adjured his son to avenge this cruel wrong on his own mother. Accordingly, driven by a sense of fear to carry out the last wish of his father, Alkmaeon murdered the woman that bore him. This horrible crime never ceased to torment him. He wandered from place to place, nowhere finding the peace and happiness for which his soul was

⁹⁴ It should be observed, in this connection, that without the aid of the commentary "The Fountain of Life" by H. J. Pollak, many a passage in these sermons would present insurmountable difficulties to most readers. Here and there, Pollak may have substituted his own thought for the thought of the author, but in the main his commentary is faithful and most helpful.

yearning. In the end, on a lonely island, he was in turn slain by an assassin, thus bringing to a dreadful end a life of shame and anguish.⁹⁵ Again, to stress the idea that in Judaism the love of God demands absolute faith in His unity, even when agonizing pain and most cruel death are visited upon us, Arama relates the story of the strange fate that befell Mani,⁹⁶ the founder of the Manichaeian movement, in which the absurdity of the belief in dualism is clearly and pathetically demonstrated. The story relates that in the days of Constantine a teacher arose by the name of Mani who sought to mislead the people with the false doctrine that two powers, the one good and the other evil, dominated the fortunes of men. Once, together with a large host of his followers, Mani resolved to invade Babylon and make many converts for his faith. When the Babylonian king had heard of his ambitious plan, he cunningly dispatched emissaries to convey greetings to the leader and assure him of deep sympathy with his teachings. He also invited him and his disciples to come to the capital city and be the guests of the palace. Thus, at the head of four hundred followers, Mani arrived in the capital and was warmly received by the King. During a banquet tendered to his guests, the King's henchmen, by royal command, led the jolly strangers, few at a time, into the palace gardens, ostensibly for further entertainment, but in reality for mass execution. When all the disciples had thus been disposed of, Mani himself was taken by the King to the scene of carnage and bidden to behold in these horrors nothing but the triumph of the evil deity over his hated rival. The King also took the liberty to suggest to the crestfallen leader that under the circumstances he could do no better than join his faithful followers. Whereupon he, too, was seized and slain, thus sealing with his own life-blood the fate of the absurd doctrine.⁹⁷

A second source on which Arama depends for his illustrative material is the analogy, in which personal observation plays the chief role. Thus, the harm done to a community by the occasional lapses of a high-principled, prominent citizen, contends the preacher, is greater than the evil that comes to it from the mis-

⁹⁵ Ser. 92, p. 58.

⁹⁶ 240-286 C. E.

⁹⁷ Ser. 90, p. 41.

deeds of an ordinary, obscure person. The fall from a powerful, fast-galloping steed, will prove more injurious to the rider than a similar fall from a slow-trotting nag.⁹⁸ Or, the Torah, while revealed to a single generation at a specific period in our history, was intended for all ages to come, to the very end of time. When one builds a water-mill by a fast-flowing stream, he takes into account a larger body of water than what at any given moment may rush over its wheels and keep them in motion.⁹⁹ Again, spiritual perfection cannot be attained by one supreme effort, or by a single method. It is an achievement, if at all consummated, that must be the result of a long and slow process of arduous experimentation. One who purposes to reach the pinnacle of a high tower will surely fall short of his aim if he expects to accomplish the ascent by a single leap. Only the man wise enough to know that he must build a ladder for himself and forthwith begin the laborious climb upward, rung by rung, can ever hope to reach the top.¹⁰⁰

There is yet a third source upon which Arama draws for the materials of his illustrations, a source which originates in the mind of the preacher and is fed by his creative imagination. It consists of narratives or descriptions allegorically conceived. In their shorter forms we know them as parables; in their more elaborate and extensive forms we may simply designate them as allegorical stories. These parables and stories are quite numerous in the sermons of Arama and are, as a rule, of the author's own invention. When, on occasion, he reproduces an allegorical episode from some story-book,¹⁰¹ or amplifies an old parable to make it more applicable to his particular theme,¹⁰² he indicates the fact if not the specific source. Some of these parables and stories, while solely intended to give added clarity and force to an idea in the sermon, may be viewed as complete products in themselves, possessing all the essential qualities of an independent composition. As narratives, they are conceived with care and discrimination and told with simplicity and charm. They are of diverse lengths and of varying degrees of skilfulness, but none is lacking

⁹⁸ Ser. 78, p. 91.

⁹⁹ Ser. 89, p. 33.

¹⁰⁰ Ser. 92, p. 63.

¹⁰¹ Ser. 62, p. 81.

¹⁰² Ser. 100, p. 167.

in interest and impressiveness. Thus, for example, in bemoaning the pitiful condition of the Jew who becomes so immersed in the material affairs of life as to forget that he belongs to a "kingdom of priests" and is therefore by virtue of his priestly function a "messenger of the Lord of hosts," the preacher adds poignancy to the situation by comparing it with the tragic plight of the man in the following parable: The men of a certain province, because of the great confidence every one reposed in him, chose one of their most reputable and public-spirited citizens to appear before the King in his far-off capital and plead with him in behalf of the entire province for a number of very necessary improvements. They provided him with all the needed funds, and sped him on his way with the fondest blessings of an affectionate people. The trusted messenger, after a long journey, arrived in the spacious metropolis and was fascinated with the sights he saw. Moreover, he was deeply impressed with the thriving commerce of the city, and perceived numerous opportunities for profitable ventures. Lured by the many prospects of the city, he delayed making his appearance in the palace of the king, until at last the whole purpose of his mission vanished from his thoughts. Instead, he eagerly plunged into the commercial life of the new community, and prospered greatly. As his profits grew, his confidence increased, and with it his pride. It was not long, however, before the reverses of fortune began to assail him. One disastrous venture followed another, until in the end a ship that carried in its cargo most of his substance sank amid sea, leaving him utterly ruined and helpless. In his despair, he decided to retrace his steps to his native place. But what an indignant community arose to meet him! "How could you," they hurled at him, "betray for a handful of coins the vital interests of your own province? How could you sacrifice the welfare of your neighbors and friends in order to satisfy a selfish ambition? Where was your sense of loyalty, your sense of pride, your sense of duty?" Their ire thus kindled, they were unable to forgive him this act of treachery. They seized upon his person and mercilessly put him to death.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ Ser. 63, p. 86. — Some of his best allegorical stories are too long to be conveniently reproduced here. Suffice it to say, however, that in sheer beauty of diction and power of imagination they rise to a high literary plane. Of this

Ordinarily, the completion of the "exposition" marks also the conclusion of the sermon. The standard method of the preacher, it would seem, required the continuous application of his message in the body of the sermon. Thus, as is often the case, in the very midst of his sermon he will pause to say: "I have seen fit to make a number of observations with reference to this scriptural passage, that we may learn from it lessons of importance concerning the right conduct of life and the proper attitude we must take toward repentance and prayer."¹⁰⁴ Not infrequently, however, Arama concludes his sermon with the compact application of its ethical and spiritual truth. "Our purpose in this sermon," he says in the closing lines of one such representative sermon, "has been fully met when, in the discussion of all the related themes, we have called attention to that which constitutes true uprightness. Thus shall our people have learned to abhor the evil and cherish the good. Verily, this principle, and none other, lies at the foundation of the good life."¹⁰⁵ But whatever be the method Arama chooses to follow in bringing his sermon to a close, in all instances he delivers a weighty and timely message to his people, a message that has not lost its appeal with the passing of the years.

IV

In the medieval Synagogue, the religious message of the pulpit issued from men who stood before the people as interpreters of transmitted truth. The preacher was the expounder and spokesman of the traditional faith, from whose sacred literature he drew the doctrines he taught and the principles of conduct he stressed. Yet, despite the fixed character of his work and the defined scope of his views, his utterances, as embodied in the best homiletical efforts, lacked neither the fervor of personal feeling nor the freshness of spontaneous thought. The truth he enunciated, though

class of composition, the following will be found to be good specimens: Ser. 101, pp. 178-185; Ser. 99, pp. 155-56; Ser. 91, pp. 47-48. His parables may be represented by the following: Ser. 18, p. 205; Ser. 23, p. 266; Ser. 52, p. 241; Ser. 70, p. 224.

¹⁰⁴ Ser. 78, p. 98.

¹⁰⁵ Ser. 85, p. 196.

part of an age-old tradition, seemed to well forth from his own consciousness. The lesson he taught he himself had learned, yet what he gave appeared to come from his own soul. With all his deep-rooted reverence for the past, he was no mere purveyor of conventional truth; intense personal conviction, born of habitual study and contemplation and fortified by a rigorous discipline of consecrated living, vibrated throughout the message of the preacher.

In the sermons of Arama, especially, this striking paradox meets us with great force. No other homiletical work that has come down to us from the Middle Ages contains such a comprehensive exposition of Jewish thought and belief. Arama was unquestionably the greatest exponent of traditional Judaism in the medieval pulpit. Yet in the pages of the *עקדת יצחק* we shall find no trace of a cold, conventional faith. Every sermon breathes the spirit of independent thought and the sentiments of an authentic personal experience.

It is quite evident that the strictest adherence to an inherited faith, unless it degenerate into blind obedience, may be compatible with the purest ratiocination of a compelling philosophy. In fact, Arama, and this holds true also of other preachers of his stamp, while believing where he could not prove, never failed to sift all the available evidence both for and against any theological doctrine he urged upon others to accept. Even the truth of those premises which men of faith have always found indispensable to their thinking, Arama sought to demonstrate, not alone with appeals to authority but with rational proof as well. In a word, the religious teachings inculcated upon his mind became by a prolonged process of searching and probing his very own, a vital part of himself. Hence, when he spoke it was with the voice of a triumphant personal faith.

Yet, since Arama's religious outlook harmonized so completely with the norms of traditional thought and belief, any attempt to reconstruct the edifice of his faith would only result in a duplication of the structure of Judaism itself, a task neither necessary nor feasible. In our exposition of his message, therefore, we shall limit ourselves to a brief presentation of those theological views and ethical principles which receive most frequent emphasis in

his sermons, and which at the same time reveal most clearly the essential qualities of his heart and mind.

The bed-rock of Arama's views and beliefs is the supreme fact of Revelation. Judaism, he repeatedly contends, is a religion of divinely-revealed truth. To be sure, reason as employed by the philosophical mind is indispensable to a fuller comprehension of the meaning and deeper import of the sacred Word. Only a simpleton will invoke faith where further exploration is indicated. Yet only the intellectual swaggerer will have the effrontery to set up his own mind as the touchstone of divine truth.¹⁰⁶ Philosophy is the servant of theology, and not its master.¹⁰⁷ Philosophy relies solely on the evidences of our reason, but revelation transcends reason; and when the mind is baffled by some religious mystery, it is because its power is incommensurate with the greatness of the task before it.¹⁰⁸ The phenomenon of prophecy, for example, despite the attempt of Maimonides to invest it with naturalness and plausibility, still looms as a great mystery, not so much because the explanations thus far given fail to satisfy the mind, but mainly because we know that it is a manifestation of something that lies outside the limited range of the human intellect.¹⁰⁹ It is to the everlasting credit of Christian theologians that while convinced of the validity and usefulness of philosophical analysis and quite eager to employ its methods in their own studies, they resolutely refuse to follow its conclusions when these go counter to the principles of the established faith. They justly claim that in assuming to arbitrate on questions of faith, philosophy is overstepping its natural boundaries.¹¹⁰ Philosophy deals with the things we know and can know; theology is concerned with those truths which only a perfect faith can fully discern.¹¹¹ Hence, with us, the recipients of the Torah, philosophy must always occupy a subordinate position, ministering to our intellectual needs as best it may, but leaving the content of our

¹⁰⁶ Ser. 79, p. 104.

¹⁰⁷ ח"ק, P. 7, p. 21; Ser. 46, p. 171.

¹⁰⁸ יד אבשלום, Prov. 14, p. 43b; Prov. 25, p. 84b; ח"ק, Ser. 1, p. 27.

¹⁰⁹ Ser. 19, pp. 214-215; Ser. 35, p. 17.

¹¹⁰ ח"ק, P. 7, p. 21.

¹¹¹ Ser. 21, pp. 233, 235; ח"ק P. 3, p. 9.

faith unaltered. For, as a guide to belief and conduct, our Torah is unique and most adequate. Greece, with all its famed philosophers, can boast of no such comprehensive system of thought, nor of any single work that possesses the internal and external perfection of Israel's Torah.¹¹² Yet, strange to say, many of our people take more pride in the fact that they dabble in philosophy, ignorant as they seem to be of its rudimentary principles, than of the fact that they are students of Bible or Talmud.¹¹³

And what is it that the Torah tries to teach us? First of all, it posits the truth that one God created and dominates the whole universe. Of course, this cardinal principle of our faith has attained the widest acceptance in our time. Untold millions lift their eyes heavenward, beseeching a just God to deliver them from the injustices of men.¹¹⁴ Even those thinkers who reject the belief in divine revelation, seem convinced of the truth of this doctrine. With only reason as guide, they yet arrive at the same conclusion. Step by step, they go from nature to God, reaching the mount of the Lord on the ladder of causation.¹¹⁵ Yet differences of a fundamental character separate the believer from the mere thinker. With us, creation is the voluntary, joyous act of God. He is master of the things His hands have wrought. He lives in the world He has formed, and refashions it at will. But the philosopher who rises to a vision of God by clambering the spiral ascent of cause and effect, discerns nothing but grim necessity in control of the forces of nature. The God he discloses is powerless in His own universe. He is Himself governed by an inner compulsion. He can change nothing that flows from His being. Of what benefit can such a conception of God be to us?¹¹⁶ Moreover, we who begin with God, whose nature is limned for us on the broad canvas of Revelation, and proceed to unlock the mystery of the human soul with this our knowledge of the divine, discover qualities in man which transfigure our lives.¹¹⁷ Partaking

¹¹² Ser. 46, p. 172; Ser. 7, p. 95; Ser. 1, p. 30.

¹¹³ יד אבשלום, Prov. 8, p. 24b.

¹¹⁴ Ser. 67, p. 164.

¹¹⁵ Ser. 77, p. 63; Ser. 67, p. 154.

¹¹⁶ Ser. 48, pp. 202, 204; Ser. 39, p. 80; פ"ק P. 5, p. 15.

¹¹⁷ Ser. 68, p. 193.

of the divine nature, we are seen to possess freedom of choice. We are not the slaves of external conditions; we are free moral agents.¹¹⁸ The philosopher, on the other hand, who designates God as the First Cause and endeavors to understand His nature by learning to know the inner workings of man's soul, succeeds only in engulfing our own spirits in the ceaseless stream of necessity. Our wills, he concludes, are fettered by predetermined conditions. Whatever is must be. Accident, and not Providence, rules our lives.¹¹⁹

We who live by the light of the Torah conceive of God as the architect of our destiny and the supreme goal of our striving. We spurn any limitation put on God's power. Our individual lives, we believe, are under His constant supervision. Those who think that God is too exalted a being to concern Himself with the trivialities of man's existence, insisting therefore that only the larger welfare of the race comes under His direct control, harbor a mistaken notion of Providence.¹²⁰ The eyes of heaven are always upon us. The man of intelligence, therefore, as he views the vast panorama unfolded before his gaze, in comparison with which his own pride and ambitious strivings sink into utter insignificance, will rivet his thoughts on the real purpose of our existence, which is none other than the whole-hearted dedication of all our powers to the service of God.¹²¹ He will endeavor, on all occasions, to bend his will to God's will, that he may thus obtain inner harmony and a large measure of spiritual freedom.¹²² For a man need but play upon the harp of his own soul to produce harmonious music.¹²³ We do not share the conviction of some alien teachers who assert that man's soul is by nature unclean and vicious, and that our chief task in life is to purge the impurities native to our spirits. We rather affirm the belief that man's soul comes pure from God; that we bear no stains from birth; and that our task is not to polish the soul but to keep it from becom-

¹¹⁸ Ser. 56, p. 294; Ser. 49, p. 412.

¹¹⁹ Ser. 63, p. 84; Ser. 74, p. 35; *יד אבשלום*, *הקדמה*, p. 3.

¹²⁰ Ser. 43, p. 125; Ser. 49, p. 212; Ser. 52, p. 245.

¹²¹ Ser. 57, p. 10.

¹²² Ser. 98, p. 135.

¹²³ Ser. 70, p. 229.

ing tarnished.¹²⁴ Nor does the salvation of the world lie outside the pale of the individual soul; let each man strive for self-perfection, and the redemption of the world will be assured.¹²⁵ What if man is made of flesh and blood? The essence of his being, what he really is, issues from his own efforts. Out of the nucleus given him at birth he can develop an intelligent soul of great power, a new and unique creation to which his own blood-relations are but strangers.¹²⁶

But to fashion this spiritual personality, it is necessary to live one's life in strict conformity with the injunctions and restrictions of the Torah. For the function of its precepts and ordinances is largely disciplinary, to curb passion and bridle inordinate desire for sensuous pleasures.¹²⁷ The physical is necessary and worthy of all the attention we give to it, but it must be made to minister to the needs of the spirit. Heaven and earth are upheld by each other and thus needed for each other's existence, but to the aspiring soul not earth but heaven is life's supreme objective. The material is to the spiritual what the scaffolding is to the slowly rising edifice, indispensable for its completion, but extraneous to its later uses.¹²⁸ It is therefore most painful to behold men of high destiny so completely engrossed in the sordid pursuit after worldly riches that they seem scarcely aware of the existence of higher aims and ends. They make gods of material success and prosperity and lie prostrate before them, as if there were no God in heaven, and as though His will were still unknown to men. Is not this the very breath and substance of paganism?¹²⁹ Of course, no one is exempt from the duty to labor for his own sustenance and the comforts of those dependent on him. Our great men of old, while placing their trust in God, never failed to exert their own powers to improve the conditions amidst which they lived.¹³⁰ To be practical and provident is not necessarily to be

¹²⁴ Ser. 68, p. 195.

¹²⁵ Ser. 56, p. 305.

¹²⁶ Ser. 66, p. 142.

¹²⁷ Ser. 44, p. 55.

¹²⁸ Ser. 85, p. 190.

¹²⁹ Ser. 45, p. 164; Ser. 41, p. 106; Ser. 6, p. 84; Ser. 32, p. 386.

¹³⁰ Ser. 26, p. 308.

wanting in faith. On the contrary, it may often result in increased capacity for further spiritual cultivation. Surely, young men who rush headlong into matrimony before they can support a family, before they have even reached maturity, are guilty not only of great folly but also of reckless disregard for the very conditions on which their mental and moral growth must depend.¹³¹ But there is a vast difference between the man who labors to procure the necessary comforts of life and the man who ceaselessly scrambles for its luxuries and superfluities. The latter, forgetting the end in the means, forfeits the privilege of realizing within himself the higher possibilities of his nature.¹³²

The Mosaic laws and the religious institutions and practices of later times, which comprise the main features of Jewish life, were designed primarily to safeguard the native purity of the soul and assure the uninterrupted development of its latent powers. The elaborate dietary laws, for example, deny us the use of certain foods, like the flesh of beast or unclean animal, that our blood may not be infected with the ferocity of the brute, that our reason may not suffer the dullness and obfuscation induced by overpowering passion, that our spirits may not be defiled. To be sure, the unimpaired inner nature of a man will endue with health and vigor all his physical organs, but this result while inevitable is incidental and forms no part of the legislator's intention.¹³³ Similarly, the institution of the Sabbath in its positive and negative aspects contemplates the creation of opportunities for spiritual enrichment. It makes the abstention from all manner of work obligatory, but bodily relaxation is not its goal. The Sabbath is essentially a day of inner restoration and sanctification. It summons us to serious study and solemn meditation, that we may grow in knowledge and sanctity.¹³⁴ In fact, all our Festivals are feast-days of the soul. Their chief purpose is to make us more keenly conscious of the divine quality of our human inheritance. The very seasons of the year from which they derive

¹³¹ Ser. 22, p. 257; Ser. 23, p. 270.

¹³² Ser. 62, p. 79; Ser. 41, p. 107; Ser. 4, p. 71.

¹³³ Ser. 60, pp. 57-58.

¹³⁴ Ser. 55, pp. 287-288.

their tone and color evidence the personal character of their spiritual appeal. The Feast of Passover, while commemorating our liberation from Egyptian bondage, also speaks to our individual souls of our first entry into the world, of the springtime period in our lives, when the torch of the spirit rose high and burned bright; even as the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of the year, with its stored harvests and extemporaneous booths, casts before us the lengthening shadow of coming gloom, prophetic of the time, so fast approaching, when after the completion of life's labors we shall be called to leave our fixed habitations and make our abode with the dead.¹³⁵ Such occasions bid us pause in the midst of our joy and consider the mystery of birth and death, of life and destiny. They are moments of revelation. And what shall we say of those religious exercises which appear unrelated to the practical experiences of life? Surely, these could be intended for no other purpose than to stimulate the soul and strengthen its powers. The "fringes" or "phylacteries," for example, associated as they are exclusively with our sense of God's presence in the world, aim to keep alive within us the thought of our higher relationship and worth and end.¹³⁶ Likewise, prayer and repentance can have for us but one function, to cleanse our hearts and ennoble our conduct.¹³⁷ Of course, when, after we have done all we could for ourselves, we put our trust in God and lay our supplications before Him, we may be confident that He will hear our cry and save us.¹³⁸ Yet prayer, like sacrifice, has ends beyond itself. It is a tree of many branches and much fruit. It is rooted in faith in God, faith in His providence and power; and out of this root there spring up such glorious virtues as reverence and devotion, love and humility, purity and holiness, and, above all, consecration unto God.¹³⁹ Even some of the early *piyyuṭim*, inasmuch as they stir the emotions of the worshipper and direct his thoughts to earnest contemplation, partake of this nature and function of prayer;¹⁴⁰ though the newer style in liturg-

¹³⁵ Ser. 59, pp. 32-34.

¹³⁶ Ser. 49, p. 212.

¹³⁷ Ser. 63, p. 110.

¹³⁸ Ser. 26, p. 308.

¹³⁹ Ser. 58, p. 21.

¹⁴⁰ Ser. 105, pp. 232, 233.

ical poetry, which has debased its original quality, renders its continued use in the Synagogue highly undesirable.¹⁴¹ This is the reason why, in Judaism, *kawana*, pure devotion as opposed to mechanical performance, is of such paramount importance. Perfunctoriness, ostentation and hypocrisy destroy piety and obliterate our vision of God.¹⁴²

Thus, the Torah provides us not only with robust principles of faith but also with a regimen of daily living which is calculated to preserve the health and purity of the soul. Even the rabbis of the Talmud, it should be noted, while preoccupied with the most practical issues of life, aimed at something higher and nobler than a well-regulated economic order; the compelling motive of their activities, too, was intensely spiritual, nothing less than the perfection of the human soul, which in their opinion could be achieved only in a society built on sound social relations.¹⁴³ Fortified by this knowledge, we shall obey implicitly all the injunctions prescribed for us, whether they satisfy the demands of our reason or not. Any attempt to rationalize the laws of the Torah must eventually lead to their complete nullification.¹⁴⁴ The Torah in its entirety, its narrative as well as legal portions, represents a species of truth that transcends the powers of human reason. The student of the Torah, therefore, while assiduous in

¹⁴¹ יד אבשלום, Prov. 31, p. 108. — While stoutly defending the occasional arrangement of biblical verses in alphabetical order, such as may be encountered in Lamentations, Proverbs and Psalms, Arama condemns unsparingly the use of the acrostic in the later *piyyuṭim*. The employment of the former, he claims, was at times made necessary in order to attest to the inspired character of the work. This occurred whenever the author was unduly depressed, as in Lamentations, or too practical in his outlook, as in Proverbs, or too embittered by personal experiences, as in Psalms. In all the above instances, the alphabetical scheme tended to allay suspicion as to the authenticity of the work by pointing to its purely Hebraic character. But there is no justification, he contends, for the acrostic with its emphasis on the name of the author and his genealogy. Some of these efforts, notably the one by Solomon Ibn Gabirol for the Atonement service, reek with pride of authorship and convey no intelligible religious ideas. "In places where I used to officiate," he concludes his strictures, "I insisted on the omission of these liturgical pieces."

¹⁴² Ser. 59, p. 42; Ser. 98, p. 145.

¹⁴³ Ser. 46, p. 179.

¹⁴⁴ Ser. 79, p. 109.

his search for a deeper thought than is visible on the surface,¹⁴⁵ will at no time venture to relinquish his belief in the truth of any incident described or statement of fact given.¹⁴⁶ Of course, for the large mass of our people, incapable of deeper penetration, the plain recital of events in its stark literalness will have to suffice; but, then, the most innocent faith will serve a more useful purpose than all the doubts and bold denials of a barren dialecticism.¹⁴⁷ The "rationalists" in our midst who forever strive to harmonize biblical truth with philosophical thought, often so dilute the content of the Torah that it ceases to have any strength or validity. In this respect they are worse than the Christians who seek repeatedly to buttress their new doctrines with citations

¹⁴⁵ Whenever Arama stresses the thought that in biblical episodes or statements we shall find more significant ideas than the literal rendition permits us to see, it must not be imagined that he has reference to the mystical notions and interpretations of the Kabbalists. His attitude toward the Kabbalah, while not exactly hostile, was by no means sympathetic. He frequently quotes from the Zohar, but he never bases his appeal on any of its conclusions. When citing a passage from the Zohar, for example, in which the author insists that only one who is thoroughly versed in the mysteries of the Shofar shall be qualified to sound it in the Synagogue, Arama merely contents himself with adding that since the men of our time are ignorant of such mysteries, we can do no more than insist that these congregational "messengers" shall be expert in the use of the Shofar, that they shall know the meaning of the prayers they recite, and, above all, that they shall perform their duty in a devotional spirit (Ser. 67, p. 170). On another occasion, in discussing a mystical reason, suggested in the Zohar, for the institution of the levirate marriage, Arama confesses that the reason given seems very strange to him, due no doubt to his weak powers of comprehension or to the profundity of the idea presented, declaring, however, that a more simple and less nebulous explanation is ready at hand (Ruth, p. 8). Again, referring to the claim of Nachmanides in his commentary to the Pentateuch that in the light of a kabbalistic statement a certain biblical verse loses its obscure character, Arama curtly dismisses the assertion with the humble declaration that such matters he is entirely too ignorant to grasp (Ser. 55, p. 284). Moreover, certain kabbalistic enterprises he frankly frowns upon. He condemns, for instance, all attempts to compute the time when the Messiah will come (Ibid., p. 296). It is quite evident that Arama was no devotee of the exotic and esoteric. He loved to delve deep into the simplest scriptural passage in the hope that he might thus uncover a fresh and exhilarating thought.

¹⁴⁶ פ"ק, P. 10, p. 28.

¹⁴⁷ Ser. 45, p. 160.

from our Bible, thus attesting to their absolute faith in the divine character of its authority.¹⁴⁸ The "rationalists," on the other hand, relying on the methods and conclusions of Greek philosophy, endeavor to eliminate from the Torah the miraculous and the mysterious, thus undermining its whole structure.¹⁴⁹

God showed unto Israel His great favor when He entrusted him with the Torah; though the strength of His great love did not become fully manifest until He saw fit to give him also such religious institutions as the Holy Days, which in addition to bringing joy into his life embody the salient ideas of Judaism.¹⁵⁰ The Torah, then, with its laws and institutions, is the spiritual patrimony of the Jew, and constitutes the evidence of his superiority among the nations.¹⁵¹ As a people whose chief possession is the Torah, it is our task by the ways of our life to be a light-giving force in the moral ascent of the race, even as the sun with its great powers of illumination and renewal revives and fructifies the earth.¹⁵² In fact, this may be said to be the primary purpose of our dispersion among the nations of the earth, that by our example the whole world may learn to recognize the potency and beneficence of our Law and its lofty principles of human conduct.¹⁵³ To be sure, the community of Israel itself has not

¹⁴⁸ פ"ח, P. 8, pp. 22-23.

¹⁴⁹ Ser. 13, pp. 155-159. — The "rationalists" whom he frequently mentions and attacks with much vehemence, are the well-known thinkers and commentators, Moses ben Joshua of Narbonne (died 1362), and Levi ben Gershon (1288-1344). Of the former's commentary to Maimuni's *Guide*, Arama speaks in rather unrestrained language. On one occasion, referring to an especially irritating statement of this commentator, the preacher declares that "it ought to be consigned to the flames, together with all his other writings," adding that if he refrains from quoting the passage in question it is mainly because he has no desire "to pollute the atmosphere" (Ser. 54, p. 267). Elsewhere, he makes the charge that it is this author's mental habit to stamp as impure everything that is pure, as unfit everything that is fit, and, above all, to expose defects hidden from the naked eye (Ser. 57, p. 7). In somewhat more measured terms, but with equal impatience, he combats the strenuous attempts of Levi ben Gershon, in his *מלחמות ה'*, to rationalize some of the most notable miracles recorded in the Bible (Ser. 73, pp. 155-157).

¹⁵⁰ Ser. 67, pp. 147, 164.

¹⁵¹ Ser. 82, p. 159.

¹⁵² Ser. 66, p. 146.

¹⁵³ Ser. 60, p. 58.

attained as yet unto that perfection of character which it is destined to reach; but when placed side by side with other existing groups, it may well boast of a large measure of goodness and uprightness. Indeed, there is much Israel can give the world; "and how passionately he yearns for the opportunity to serve his God and live by His commandments in the sight of all men, instead of being constrained, as he is today in the lands of his exile, to practise his religion in hidden places, lest he be mocked and terrorized by his gentile neighbors."¹⁵⁴ Of course, there can be no doubt but that the persecutions directed against us serve a beneficent purpose. What our religious discipline has failed to accomplish, persecution and oppression bid fair to achieve; they do seem to help weaken the hold materialistic ambitions and desires have on our souls.¹⁵⁵ The insufferable burdens we have to shoulder, even as the primeval Flood that swept away a wicked generation, must have been intended by God for our spiritual regeneration, that a clear vision of our human destiny might be kindled in our hearts.¹⁵⁶ Yet there is this striking anomaly: the bitter life in exile, which tends by its very struggles and hardships to awaken in us a keener sense of our true aims, is also responsible for the slow progress we are making toward the greater perfection of our spirits. In the diaspora, exposed as we are to many alien influences of a deleterious nature, we cannot hope to expedite the process of our spiritual transformation. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly evident that unless we achieve physical liberation, both in the political and economic spheres, we shall not attain the spiritual emancipation we so hopefully anticipate.¹⁵⁷

Meanwhile, our strength is actually waning. On the one hand, thousands, yea, tens of thousands are leaving our ranks, surrendering the old loyalties under the pressure of cruel decrees. That these apostates have found no peace and happiness in the change

¹⁵⁴ ש"ש, p. 1. — Amid the gloom and pathos enveloping Jewish life in the diaspora, Arama finds cause for gratitude in the fact that in all countries the Jews are regarded as "subjects of the King," enjoying thereby a more favorable position than would have been theirs had they been reduced to the status of slaves, to be bought and sold in the open market (Ser. 98, p. 150).

¹⁵⁵ Ser. 23, p. 271.

¹⁵⁶ Ser. 33, p. 398

¹⁵⁷ Ser. 28, p. 334.

is tragically clear. They are despised and humiliated everywhere, eternal objects of suspicion and hate and cruel vindictiveness. They are hounded and tortured in all the provinces of Spain. Those who have escaped the consuming flames are hunting for safe hiding-places, and those who may still be seen at their accustomed tasks are the victims of a paralyzing fear that defies description.¹⁵⁸ Then, on the other hand, there are many in our midst who, though they have not renounced the ancient faith, pay no heed to the religious duties devolving upon them as Jews. Neither in character nor in mental outlook do they exhibit any influence of Judaism's teachings; they are Jews only in name.¹⁵⁹ They belittle the value of Jewish knowledge, and extol the wisdom of Aristotle. They admonish the Jewish youth not to fritter away their time in talmudic studies but to devote themselves rather to the study of Greek philosophy. They try to win the confidence of these untrained and inexperienced lads by regaling them with some flashy philosophical observations and by initiating them into the free-and-easy habits of the secular student.¹⁶⁰ Thus, amidst the distressing conditions of our life, which call

¹⁵⁸ Ser. 98, pp. 149-150. — It seems that the forced conversion of the Spanish Jews gave rise on occasion to some interesting theological questions. One such instance arose when the former wife of a Jewish apostate, who remained loyal to her faith, insisted on obtaining the traditional bill of divorce from her neo-Christian spouse. The Christian clergy argued that since conversion spelled a new-birth her former husband was as non-existent to his Jewish wife as if he had actually died. A Jewish divine took the stand that birth, and not doctrinal loyalty, was the determining factor in the human personality. Arama sided with the latter point of view, though in the talmudic maxim that "a proselyte is like a new-born babe" he sensed some support for the contrary view. He, too, contends that a Jew is one by birth, and that not even apostasy can obscure his Jewish origin. Yet he perceives the difficulty involved in trying to convince representatives of the Church, with whom the doctrine of conversion admitted of no discussion, of the validity and justness of the Jewish appraisal of personality. He suggests, therefore, a different line of reasoning, in which the main points are that while conversion may work a radical change in one's individuality, it cannot divest him of his humanity; that marriage involves a purely human relationship as well as a union of souls consecrated by religion; and that as a man, therefore, the Jewish apostate still owed conjugal obligations to the woman of his choice (Ser. 97, pp. 130-131).

¹⁵⁹ Ser. 60, p. 55.

¹⁶⁰ Ser. 46, p. 173.

for the utmost strength and fortitude, they seek to weaken our stamina and destroy our will to live as Jews by fostering interests and views so perilous to our religious discipline.¹⁶¹ They forget, however, the truth verified by their own historical experience, that Israel lived in freedom and independence only when he subjected his life to the will of God, and that whenever he sought to free himself from the "yoke of the heavenly kingdom" he found himself bearing the yoke of slavery imposed on him by foreign powers.¹⁶²

Yet Israel need not despair. The love God has for His people can never be extinguished. God has not forsaken us; we have forsaken our God. We need but return unto Him to have His love restored to us.¹⁶³ Superficially, it would appear as if the taunt of the gentiles that we are the rejected of God were indisputably true. For fourteen long centuries we have been wanderers on the earth, driven from our ancient glories, exiled from our home. But history discounts the importance of arguments based on mere duration. An interval of over two-thousand years separated the creation of the world from the consecration of Israel at Sinai. No, the length of the term of our exile holds no discouragement for us.¹⁶⁴ We can discern a special providence in the fact that it is among Christian and Mohammedan nations that we are scattered. For, in whatever distorted a form, our Torah has become the property of these nations; at least, they subscribe to the essential principles of our faith. We are thus privileged to live in an environment in which, though we suffer much sorrow and pain, the perpetuation of Judaism is assured.¹⁶⁵ The times in which we live challenge our best efforts. We who have accepted the "yoke of His kingdom" must labor incessantly for the ever-increasing perfection of our souls. Therein we shall find our greatest freedom. We dare not become the slaves of greed and pleasure. When we withdraw from life's luxuries, we shall draw closer to God's presence. Our present task is to cultivate a love for the simple life, that we may be free for the study of God's law and the faithful performance of our religious duties. We

¹⁶¹ פ"ן, P. 12, p. 47.

¹⁶² Ser. 98, p. 138.

¹⁶⁴ Ser. 88, p. 24.

¹⁶³ Ser. 48, p. 202.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 26.

belong to a people designated as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation"; we should live as becomes the subjects of such a kingdom.¹⁶⁶

V

Arama addressed his message to the men of his own generation, but the influence of his work and spirit is still with us. It lives in every Jewish pulpit in which the preacher's art is still practised. From him preaching in the Synagogue received some of its best-known qualities. It was Arama who gave to the Jewish sermon its intellectual character. If later preachers strove to make ideas the foundation-stones of their homiletical structure, it was because Arama was their best teacher. The *עקדת יצחק* taught them that scriptural truth, to be plumbed to its utmost depth, required much power of concentration, and that religious ideas, to win ready assent, called for the steady cultivation of the habit of thought. From this work, the most popular preacher's manual, they also learned that the sermon was an organic whole, in which some dominating idea controlled its separate parts. Nor were they slow to perceive from a careful study of these sermons, that preaching was an art in which the exercise of the imagination and pictorial power promised to achieve effects of great moral value. Truth is cold until warmed by emotion; thought is dull and drab until tinged with the vivid colors of the imagination. This lesson they could not escape as they pondered over the pages of their favorite preacher. But Arama, the preacher's preacher, did more than help vitalize the substance, and broaden the technique, of the sermon; by his work he quickened the spirit and refined the personality of the Jewish preacher. His reverence, his piety, his faith, his spiritual discernment, his passion for right-living, his quenchless thirst for God, inspired subsequent synagogal teachers with a sense of the lofty character of their calling, and revealed to them the secret of the pulpit's power and influence. That so many of the old preachers who came under the influence of his sermons followed his footsteps and breathed his spirit, testifies to the endless triumphs of prophetic consecration.

¹⁶⁶ Ser. 69, p. 209; Ser. 77, p. 68; Ser. 78, p. 100.

THE ME'IL ZEDAQAH

(Second Article)

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

THIS article is a continuation of the study occupying pages 503 to 567 in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. XI (1936). We had noticed how the *Me'il Zedaqah* attempts to defend the poor against the disparagements of the uncharitable. We had traced its rebuttal of the charges that the poor are sinful, that they are impostors, that they are work-shy, that they are self-seeking. But many additional pretexts for uncharitableness rear their ugly heads. Further arguments which our author feels called upon to refute are:

1. The poor are devoid of decency (Introd.). Allowed to beg from door to door, they grow audacious (1565). They ask and ask and never stop asking. Sometimes they become insolent and, when their demands are not promptly complied with, their cursing exceeds all bounds (1565). Surely the Torah imposes upon us no obligations with regard to such hoodlums.¹

2. Insofar as they seek alms of the well-to-do when the real helper is God, the poor betray a shocking deficiency of faith (928).

3. The poor are the cause of their own poverty (1565). Their blood is on their own head.

4. Sometimes a poor person, if aided, may go forth and sin and in that sin the almsgiver would himself be implicated (1124). Since destitution deters from sin, would it not be well to perpetuate destitution?

5. The money, though pledged, should not be paid because it might find its way to the unworthy (1321).

¹ As a matter of fact, the outright giving of alms, while often commended in the Bible is nowhere commanded.

This enumeration of the arguments does not appear in the *Me'il Zedaqah*. It is supplied by the author of this article. The *Me'il Zedaqah* is a trackless jungle.

6. The receipt of alms might endanger the recipient's life, for is it not written (Prov. 15.27), "He who hateth gifts shall live" (1602)?

7. If assistance is delayed until the ultimate depth of poverty has been reached, the recipient will have sunk to that merciful level at which alms cease to be humiliating (1600). An extremely pitiable condition might even move the Divine compassion to bless the sufferer with prosperity (1600).

8. While alms need not be withheld entirely, they should not go to subsidize marriage (1360 answer 10). Such would tend to increase the population requiring alms.

9. A poor person, if loaned money, is unlikely to repay. This would provoke hatred between borrower and lender and the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" would be violated (1596).

10. Baba Meṣia 62a teaches that, in case there is not sufficient food for both, "thy life taketh precedence over the life of another," while Prov. 11.17 cautions against the troubling of one's own flesh—all of them arguments against giving to the poor (842, 1472). Something must be retained for the uncertainties of the future (841). Think of the sums that taxes absorb (1745)! A person spending money on benevolence would be left penniless (524, 1472). His losses would be intolerable (487). There would be danger of financial breakdown (1549, 1745).

11. At the other extreme is the person so convinced that charity is rewarded with good fortune that, for this very reason, he declines to give charity or to induce others to give (1410, 1411).² He shrinks from good fortune whether for himself or for others. Wealth exposes one to thieves and despoilers.

12. The poor are so numerous that any attempt to aid them is futile (1565, 1745). Were each indigent to receive only one *Peruṭah*, there would still be insufficient *Peruṭot* to go around (1745). Relief should be limited to the blind and the lame (37, 1565). The others should be required to work and the assisting of anyone who is able to work should be punishable by law (1565).

² This "argument" is mentioned here although the *Me'il Zedaḳah* does not present it with the same scorn that it heaps upon the other "arguments."

13. Why worry? The poor will not die. Others will help them (1124, 1600). As Lev. 25.35 intimates, everyone in the Jewish group is the poor person's "brother" (1600).

14. Since God loves the poor, why not leave their sustenance to Him (Introd., 1565)? The eyes of the Lord being upon the land "from the beginning of the year to the end thereof" (Deut. 11.12), what occasion is there for any of us to grow anxious about the poor of the land (968)? Does not helping the poor insinuate that God's loving care is inadequate (1627)? What blasphemy!

15. Poverty is the sign of God's displeasure (1696). Should one befriend those whom God condemns? The non-giver is the one who really conforms to the Will Divine (1738).

Such are the arguments which our author deems it necessary to controvert.

THE POOR ABOUND IN VIRTUES

To the contention that the poor are devoid of decency,³ the answer is that the poor are devoid of iniquity (582).

The poor are characterised by humility. The eight biblical names for "poor" listed in Lev. r. 34.6 imply the poor person's innocence of the eight forms of haughtiness located in the head, namely, in the thoughts, the forehead, the eyes, the ears, the nose, the tongue, the palate, the face (1341 end). To those eight foci of arrogance, the eight-fold incidence of the word "what" in the morning prayer corresponds—"What are we? What is our life? What is our goodness?" etc. Indeed, anyone, even a wealthy person (1616B) yearning to possess humility must, imitating King David (474, 736, 921, 932, 937, 945, 1616B),⁴ assume the poor people's manner (693, 963). And how important is humility! Humility surpasses all bringing of sacrifices (914). The humble outrank the angels (722). The angels act from necessity

³ *Supra* p. 635.

⁴ 1616B means the second of the paragraphs numbered 1616 in this carelessly numbered volume. See XI, p. 504, note 8. In this article, XI refers to volume XI of the *Hebrew Union College Annual* which contains the prior installment of this study.

but contrition arises in the heart only from free choice (722). For proximity to the Divine, humility is the *sine qua non* (325 end, 582, 930, 957, 1252). God is near the broken-hearted (1341). His utensils are the broken ones (582).

How sorely the poor person is tempted, yet how staunchly he withstands! His children cry for bread; he prefers death to life (1140.6).⁵ Still, he succumbs to no apostasy. He might plausibly berate God for having sent him out of the dependency of his pre-existent state into a worse dependency on earth; yet he forbears (1140.9).⁶ That he abstains from committing suicide constitutes one of the many particulars in which he is Divinely exalted (1608). To mitigate his sufferings, the poor person might feel impelled to blaspheme, steal, lie, and kill.⁷ He might, considering his dire circumstances, even commit those acts with impunity.⁸ Nonetheless, he refrains (1140.17). Though the rich may fret over trifles the poor, habituated to distress, bear crushing afflictions resignedly (1140.24). Verily, such resignation closes the mouth of the Devil (906). Reverence is so characteristic of the poor that poverty has been the punishment of lack of reverence (1229); for *irreverence*, poverty serves as the corrective. Far from despising God, the humble accept in love their Heaven-sent tribulations (914).

The scantiness of the food consumed by the poor emaciates the flesh but expands the soul (1140.28, 1253). That is to say, poverty exemplifies not the voluntary, extreme or needless asceticism which is reprehensible but that involuntary asceticism which brings God near. The broken heart of the needy is the true sacrifice at God's altar (1140.14). In the seething flames of hunger, the poor are literally consumed as an oblation unto the Lord (1140.5).

That which has already been noted regarding the sinlessness

⁵ In 1140.6, the decimal means that the paragraph contains a series of enumerated points. 1140.6 means paragraph 1140, point 6.

⁶ This is contrary to 579 (Cf. XI, p. 517) and numerous other passages cited in XI, p. 563.

⁷ In 1608, the statement occurs that the temptations of wealth are greater than those of poverty.

⁸ See XI, pp. 561, 562.

of the poor⁹ is amplified by these reflections. To the *Yezer Hara'*, the poor are immune as the rich are not (741). A noted example was the poverty-stricken Rab Kahana who, assailed by a horrible temptation, miraculously escaped (621). Even when under no necessity of doing so, the sages lived a life of poverty so that their evil inclination might atrophy (615). Humility neutralizes the evil inclination (582, 615, 952, 972). Inasmuch as sins come essentially from pride (1140.6, 1252), the broken-hearted are linked with the good inclination (615, 1356). God helps the humble transmute the evil inclination into the good one (915). The poor, in a word, are vessels clean of sin (1140.6), because poverty purges men of sin (1627). In the lowly, sin is not even so much as expected (1339). If the offering on the altar is a substitute for the sinner who deserves to be slaughtered and burnt, the poor person, being such a holocaust, has expiated more than enough (1140.5), just as Israel's poverty was presumed to render expiation by political subjection superfluous (524).

It must further be recalled how constantly the thoughts of the poor dwell upon death (1140.31), partly because their privations bring them near to death and partly because they crave death as a release (1140.6.31). But what is there more effective than thoughts of death for routing the evil disposition? One of the several reasons why '*ayin*, "eye," and '*ani*, "poor" consist of the same letters is the fact that the poor have ever in mind the All-Seeing Eye and the All-Hearing Ear (1407). And this prompts them to give sin a wide berth.¹⁰

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Material extensively divergent from these encomiums will be presented at length in a later installment of this study. Some of this material was used in XI, p. 564, note 107. One passage states that poverty causes sin and thus creates in man the opposite of the Divine likeness (346). Also Prov. 30.9 is quoted to show that poverty and sin are not far removed from one another (1341). Poverty drives people to thefts, frauds, and other crimes. Wealth, on the other hand, keeps people from antagonizing God (1266). In the case of judges, wealth is needed in order to prevent venality (1282.12). The prophet especially needs wealth in order that he might have courage; also that he might possess mental detachment; and also that he might command the means for practicing benevolence (612).

Poverty is also associated with devotion to sacred study (489). The cultivators of the Torah are likely to be not those whose wealth makes them forget the Torah but those who are devoid of wealth (482, 953 in Lemberg ed.). Having naught else to occupy them, the poor devote to the Torah their entire time (1140.10). The poor person's joy in the Torah decidedly exceeds that of the rich person; the mind of the rich is absorbed in business (1373). This forms one of the particulars in which the Torah resembles rain, the poor rejoicing in rain because it assures plenty, the rich disliking rain because it lowers prices (1373). Poverty, again, is needed to supply the humility from which the cultivation of the Torah is inseparable (482, 952, 961). Since the Torah is rooted in affliction, its sustenance depends on those who experience affliction (1400). The Torah, that spiritual food, can be relished only by those who suffer insufficiency of material food (954). The Torah itself is said to have petitioned God to make its portion with the lowly (952, 954, 961).

The wisdom of the poor is one of their Divinely loved qualities (1675). Some of the poor belong to the type in whom intellectual contemplation crowds out the consciousness of bodily wants (1464).¹¹ That is why the word *hesed* contains the initials of "wisdom sustaineth the needy," *hokmah somek(et) dallim*.¹²

Whatever the *mizvot* practiced by the poor, the attachment to the Divine manifested thereby is extraordinary (1140.13). Meritorious deeds rendered amid hardships mean more than those identical deeds performed in ease. A poor man's humble offering of herbs represented far more exertion and sacrifice than a rich man's offerings of an ox (528). This applies notably to the benevolences of the poor toward one another (21, 1536, 1619, 1635, 1728, 1360 answers 2, 3, 4). From the list of philanthro-

¹¹ This is contradicted in 564. See XI, p. 520.

¹² Other passages assert as categorically that, through poverty the cultivation of the Torah suffers interference (524, 1690). See also XI, p. 562. If sermons are recommended to induce the poor to use some of their copious leisure for study, this hardly comports with the picture of a spontaneous craving for study among them. The reference, farther down, to those who study in spite of poverty is also out of line with this supposition.

pists in the *Yalkut* to *Wayera'*,¹³ the name of Job is omitted because the list includes only those who did not wait with their benevolence until they became affluent (1360 answers 2, 3, 4). The difficult expression in Nah. 1.2a, refers to the poor who not only receive alms but also give alms (1619), while one of the fourteen particulars in which the poor are divinely exalted lies in their sympathy with those whose plight is similar (1608).^{13a} Sometimes a needy person accepts alms which he passes on to others (21). The poor who share their pittance with other poor are among those (Prov. 22.9) who, having "a bountiful eye, shall be blessed" (1635). More than the rich man's largess bestowed nonchalantly is the poor man's farthing yielded with self-laceration (1536).

A poor person, bringing a sacrifice to the altar, offers not only the object sacrificed but his own flesh and blood in addition (1728); he has to forego food in order to afford the sacrifice. Similarly, a poor person who presents a farthing to another poor person surrenders not only the farthing but, in addition, a part of his own body.

Especial commendation is due a poor person who returns a find (607, 759). Such an act, plainly more meritorious in the poor than in the wealthy, is honored by Divine proclamation (607).

Then, there are those who, despite hardships, pursue the study of sacred lore (542, 944, 955, 1307, 1690), not waiting until they amass wealth (1307). While devotion to the Torah is enjoined in Deut. 32.1, upon rich and poor alike, special credit guerdons that of the needy (1690). They who study, despite hardship, will be filled with the brightness of the Shekinah (542). Some necessitous people crave wealth only that they might study with less interruption (1307).

One may truthfully say that the poor are more loyal to Judaism than the wealthy (325). Sometimes, a poor person, in order to own ritual phylacteries and fringes, goes without eating

¹³ *Yalkut Šim'oni*, Warsaw 1876, p. 48 at note 78 contains this passage.

^{13a} The contrary observation appears in 974 and 1752. See XI, p. 564, footnote 107.

(1313). A special shrine exists on high for such holy ones.¹⁴ Impetuniousness, moreover, which hinders the performance of certain commands prolongs and intensifies the pondering on those commands (1140.4); and, with ponderings of that type, God rates the thought as the deed. How properly have the poor been likened to the moon, the basis of the Jewish calendar, while the rich have been compared with the sun, the basis of the gentile calendar (325)! It was characteristic of a poor man to decline to eat at the table of one who neglected the prescribed hand-washing (1278). The Rabbis did well to reward that poor man with a gift of four hundred *Zuzim*.

Finally, it is to be considered that one who enables others to acquire merits becomes himself vested with those merits. The poor, offering opportunity for alms, are graced with all the deserts which the wealthy acquire by distributing alms (1140.1).

HUMAN AND DIVINE INDEBTEDNESS TO THE POOR

Then there are the benefits, both natural and supernatural, which the poor confer upon society. It is they who perform the world's hard work—plowing, sowing, reaping (1140.19). Thus it is they who render the world habitable. If all men were wealthy, who would plant, harvest, thresh and build (1598)? The rich are too fastidious for such tasks. If the world, lacking poor people, depended on the rich for its heavy toil, the world would disintegrate. The poor are, to human society, what hands and feet are to the rest of the body. If all portions of the body were to fulfil the functions of the head and none the functions of hands and feet, the body would expire. Thus it happens that, in the synagogue, discourses for the uplift of the poor must be delivered on Sabbaths and Holy Days because, at other times, the poor are not in the synagogue but at work (1526).¹⁵ One of the several thoughts to be derived from an alteration of Prov. 22.28 from *gebul 'olam* to *gebul 'olim* is that the poor, in

¹⁴ Another reference to a shrine of the needy appears in paragraph 1122. See *infra* p. 657.

¹⁵ This does not comport with *supra* p. 640 that the poor have nothing but the Torah to occupy their time and attention.

performing their dangerous tasks, ascend, as '*olim* ladders, scaffolds, and trees (1515).

But there are many other services for which the wealthy are obligated to the necessitous. Think of the advantages which the poor confer upon the rich merely by furnishing the opportunity for almsgiving (1140.1).¹⁶ One of these advantages, as we saw, is the preservation of the world.¹⁷ The preservation of the world which the poor thus promote is of benefit to the wealthy alone (1605). For the poor, it were better if there were no world—so wretched is their life (1605).¹⁸ But this is, by no means, all. The poor also serve the rich as a warning of the poverty which will overtake those whose speech is arrogant and whose conduct is blameworthy (1140.11, 1356). Observing the poor, one says: "I shall avoid sinful indulgences, lest a turn of fortune's wheel make me also poor. It is nothing but the Divine mercy that allows me to be other than poor. I must avoid sin, lest I provoke God" (1356). Also of inestimable benefit to the wealthy is the rain for which the prayers of the poor are so markedly efficacious (510). And this says nothing of the rain which, thanks to the fact that there are recipients of charity, descends as one of the numerous rewards of charity (411, 1674).¹⁹

The prayers of the poor in behalf of their benefactors are invariably heard on high (219, 1468). God heeds the prayers of the generous giver himself (1468). Still the supplication of the poor is not superfluous. It is an antidote against Satan.

A striking instance of a benefit for which a wealthy person was indebted to a poor person developed once at the altar (528). The ox of a rich man ate the herbs of a poor man and, as a consequence, disgorged a needle which would have rendered the ox unfit. Somewhat akin was the case of a wealthy man who, ignorant of the law, brought two doves as a sin offering (1331); he should have brought an ox (1331).²⁰ That niggard offering was

¹⁶ See XI, pp. 525-549.

¹⁷ See XI, p. 523.

¹⁸ See XI, pp. 519, 520.

¹⁹ Elsewhere we are apprised that the rich dislike rain (1373). *Supra* p. 640. On rain as the reward for almsgiving, XI, p. 528.

²⁰ "Ox" (*tura*) is the word used in the passage quoted here from the Zohar. In Lev. 4.3, a bullock (*par*, not *šor*) is mentioned as the sin-offering of the

rejected by the priest; whereupon the wealthy man, convicted of ignorance, proceeded to study and became a scholar. He learnt that doves (Lev. 5.7) are the sin offering only of the poverty-stricken. In accordance with this, that man of means—seconded by the Zohar and by our own author—credited the poor with furnishing the incentive which led him to the Torah. The incident further illustrated the power of alms to enhance mental acuity,²¹ the well-to-do individual having enjoyed that result of the alms which he distributed in the course of his schooling. He thus found himself additionally under obligation to those who needed alms.

Then there are the gains which accrue to one who associates with the sick, the afflicted and the pious; and pious people are usually poor people (1489). In other kinds of people, religious faith is likely to be defective. But the light of the Shekinah falls on him who associates with the pious poor. His soul becomes roused to cling to God; just as Abraham, consorting with the angels, acquired the perfection of the angels (1489).

Again, the poor are valuable as a test for distinguishing the seed of Abraham from that of the *Siṭra 'Aḥera* and those who serve God from those who do not, the degree of one's charitableness being the infallible guage (1140.20).

The poor, furthermore, bless mankind by facilitating the manifestation of Divine Providence (1252). The impoverishment of the wealthy may demonstrate God's power (1140.12). But a more striking evidence of that power is the enrichment of the needy. God exhibits His mercy through the poor just as, by forgiving the wicked, He uses the wicked as a device for displaying His patience (745). The poor are also the expedient through which God, caring for those in need, can demonstrate His lowliness (745). Again, just as pride sends the Shekinah soaring out

high priest. The sin-offering of a normally circumstanced lay person is a goat or a sheep (vv. 28, 32). The passage in the Zohar quotes not from Lev. 4 but from Lev. 14.21 which treats of the sin-offering to be brought by an indigent person at the lustration after recovery from *zara'at*. In Lev. 14, as well as in Lev. 4, the well-to-do person brings a ewe as a sin-offering—not an ox.

²¹ See XI, pp. 538, 539.

of human reach (1140.7, 1252), the humility of the poor entices the Shekinah back to earth, while the meekness of the poor muzzles the Power Sinister (906). Through the poor, the world is shielded from God's wrath (1140.27). It is well known—witness the case of Rabbi Judah Hanasi—that the sick, by their sufferings, save the world from mishap (1140.18). But the poor are, so to speak, always sick. A world preservative is likewise the study of the Torah to which, we have seen, the poor are particularly adapted (1140.10). Such men as Simon bar Abba (592) and R. Ḥanina (548) are famous illustrations of how the world depends upon the indigent. The rich are as incomplete without the poor, as a man is incomplete without his wife (1314).

Outstanding are the benefits conferred by the poor upon Israel. Israel's salvation is hastened by the poor (1140.27) because the poor supply Israel with the opportunity to practice the benevolence which saves (1608.9). The Temple itself stood by reason of the poor dwelling in its shadow (572). Inasmuch as the poor shed tears readily, their prayers are attended by copious weeping and such praying is supremely efficacious (1140.15). This includes the prayers in Israel's behalf (1140.15). Those tear-drenched prayers will deliver Israel from all of his troubles (911).

God Himself derives benefits from the poor. Those aforementioned manifestations of His providence and His tenderness are boons to Him as well as to man (745, 1140.12). Aptly are the poor called the Shekinah's chariot; the *kal*, in Isa. 19.1, on which the Lord rideth, being identical with '*ani* by *gimatria* (745). Just as the wicked serve God in the sense of enabling Him to manifest His forgiveness, so do the poor, as we have noticed, serve Him by functioning as the channels through which He displays His lowliness and His care (745). God is enabled, through the poor, to reveal the synthesis of exaltedness and lowliness possible for Him though impossible for men (1140.13). The poor are His utensils (582, 1330), and His vessels (1356, 1365). By them, is the Shekinah gladdened (1356). They are God's sanctuary, the Shekinah's lowly abode (1433). This is one of the reasons why Lev. 23.22, which mentions the poor,

stands between the two lists of sacred days (1433). The poor are also God's troops (1501) and God's emissaries (1699). They occupy, cabalistically speaking, the position of "best man" (*šošbin*), between the supermundane personages, *Mal'kut* and *Maṭronita* (1537). The Shekinah's return from exile depends upon the poverty-stricken (1675).²²

So much by way of rejoinder to the argument that the poor are worthless.

THIRTEEN MORE DISPARAGEMENTS REBUTTED

A. We now take up the second argument, namely, that the poor are deficient in faith. To the charge that the asking of alms by the poor betrays such defect, the reply is that an abiding faith in God is one of their striking characteristics (1489). The life of the poor person is oriented toward the Eternal (1341). Need turns the eyes heavenward (582, 609), just as, in the wilderness, Israel's eyes were daily drawn heavenward by the manna (1140.3). That very characteristic of the poor person's eye is one of the truths intimated by the fact that the letters of 'ani, "poor," and of 'ayin, "eye," are identical (1140.31). The yearning for God, so rare among the privileged, is so pronounced among the poverty-stricken that, for this very reason, the poor are called God's people (1157). While the rich trusts in money when trouble comes, the poor trusts in the Everlasting (1140.25). For every insignificant gift, the poor thanks God as though obtaining it were a miracle (671). The initials of the Hebrew words in Ps. 145.4a for "One generation shall praise Thy works to another" are actually the letters of the word *dallim*, "the needy" (1341). When one is poor, one's deeds win no applause or acclaim. Hence it is only in the name of Heaven that those deeds are performed (1341).²³

²² Apparently in the sense that the repatriation of the Shekinah awaits the benevolence for which the poor furnish the opportunity.

²³ Somewhat out of line with this is the thought that one of the numerous ideas obtainable by altering Prov. 22.28 to read not *gebul 'olam* but *gebul 'olim* is that the poor are 'olim, "ascending," in the sense of trusting that, some day they will rise to a better economic status (1515). There are also the poor who desire wealth—albeit for very worthy reasons (1307, 1695).

B. The argument (number three) that the poor are the cause of their own poverty is only one of a series of chicaneries which usually begins with the one quoted above²⁴ as number twelve. If the listener is impressed with number twelve, the next step is to offer number one and then to propound number fourteen. Then, if the listener can stand it any longer, he hears the sophistry which we are now considering to wit: that the poor are the source of their own misery (1565).

We have already shown that poverty and wealth depend on the stars or on Divine predetermination.²⁵ The wily insinuations to the contrary betray in their proponents a hybrid descent from Lilith and from the snake which poisoned Eve (1565). Their saccharine babblings resemble those of their serpentine ancestor (1565). Listeners infected with their virus come presently to think that declining to help the poor is entirely proper. For one's temporal good now and one's eternal good hereafter one should rebuke such insolence severely.

C. The fourth argument runs that poverty is something desirable because it prevents sin. The philanthropist who relieves poverty would be the cause of sin and would have to stand accountable.

To this, we reply that no guilt attaches to any act performed with righteous intent (1124). Guilt rests only on the wrong-doer himself. How the poor person may deport himself eventually is, after all, a matter of doubt.²⁶ In the ancient cities of refuge (Deut. 19.5), asylum was granted the refugee even when his innocence was uncertain. Similarly, one who aids a needy person is immune to guilt, even though the future probity of that person might be dubious (1124).

D. The fifth argument is concocted by those who, having pledged a gift, decline to pay their pledges, claiming that some unworthy person might get the money (1321).

All that can be said about one who talks and acts thus is

²⁴ *Supra* p. 636. It must be stressed that these numberings are not furnished by the *Me'il Zedaqah* but are devised by the writer of this article. See note 1, *supra*.

²⁵ See XI, pp. 565, 566.

²⁶ See XI, p. 563.

that he is an unmitigated rascal. His sparsity of *mizwot* have brought him to this state of mind (1321). His few *mizwot* are, by a Divine curse, so vitiated that they are utterly inadequate to counterbalance his *'aberot* (1321). One of the synonyms for poor,²⁷ the word *dak*, contains the initials of the phrase, *dober kezabim* referring to the calumnies against the poor with which wealthy egoists excuse their sordidness (1665).

E. To the sixth argument—that the recipient of alms, failing to be one “who hateth gifts” (Prov. 15.27) undergoes peril of death—the reply is that such peril does not exist when the giver reaps some advantage (1602). In benevolence, the giver most decidedly enjoys an advantage. His gift secures for him God’s benediction.

F. In reply to the seventh argument, claiming that it is to the interest of the poor person if one delays help until the utmost depths of poverty are touched, we cite Lev. 25.35, “If his hand fail with thee” (1600). “Hand” is in the singular. One is not to delay until both hands fail. A tottering person must be kept from stumbling and sinking in the mire. Once he sinks, the cleanness which he possessed before the mishap may get beyond restoration. The person who waits until his unfortunate fellow has reached the depths will, by that time, have so habituated himself to uncharitableness as to be incapable of anything except uncharitableness. The entire argument is a device of the evil inclination to defer action until either the possible recipient or the possible giver will have died, without the *mizwah*’s ever having been performed (1600).

G. To those who advance argument eight, that the poor should not be assisted to marry because the result will be additional poor, the counterargument comes from the *Yalqut to Wayera*’, “Whoso doth not act to sustain human life and doth not sustain human life causeth his own death—witness the case of Nabal in 1 Sam. 25.10, 38.”²⁸ The two-fold occurrence of the word “sustain” shows that sustaining is meant in a racial sense as well as in an individual sense (1360, question and answer 10).

²⁷ Eight are listed in Lev. r. 34, 6 and seven in the *Sefer Haḥayyim*.

²⁸ The passage is in the *Yalqut Šime'oni*, Warsaw 1876. See *supra* note 13.

H. Argument nine which fears that, as a result of unpaid loans, the love of neighbor commanded in Lev. 19.18 may be marred obtains its refutation in Ex. 22.24 which speaks of lending silver (1596). One need not lend gold and become chagrined if the debt remains unpaid. Or one can view the grant as a pure gratuity with all of the Divinely bestowed benefits to one's self which such an act procures (1596).²⁹

I. Nothing but stinginess ails the proponents of argument ten, that benevolence invites bankruptcy (1472, 1745). The wealthy devisers of this sophistry have enough money for every kind of vanity (1745). A man who eagerly enables his wife to stage parties for her prattling lady friends and who, to please his wife, even endures their chatter will grumble against giving or having his wife give a penny to the necessitous (1661). Such a man averts his eyes from the fact that there is a Divine replenishment³⁰ and that, by reason of charity, one's possessions are not at all diminished—like the cistern (בֵּר) which retains its level no matter how much the water removed (1472). Bleeding at the nose is relieved by means of an arm lancing which draws the blood back to the center of the body (1472).³¹ To this type of heart action, the words in Psalm 112.7 refer, "His heart is steadfast trusting in the Lord" (1472). The fact that *damim* signifies "blood" as well as "money" indicates that the bestowal of charity will heal the conditions which necessitate the depleting outlays. The righteous person trusts in the Lord in that he trusts that the Lord will reimburse (1472).³²

Psalm 112.10 disposes of the one who imagines that the liberal giver is plunging toward insolvency (1549). It is the evil inclination who whispers: "The expenditures will prove staggering!" (487). The Devil inspires the phantasy that the alms-giver will presently be without food for himself or his family (841).

Would not one spend all of one's money to be delivered from a penalty imposed by man (841)? Why then hesitate about the charity which delivers from the fire of hell?³³

²⁹ See XI, pp. 520, 547.

³⁰ See XI, p. 529.

³¹ A similar metaphor in 368 quoted in XI, p. 540.

³² See XI, p. 529 ff.

³³ See XI, p. 541

That argument about the uncertain future would contain some plausibility if acquisition depended on one's own strength which waxes today and wanes tomorrow (841). But acquisition does not rest on one's own prowess. It is entirely a matter of Divine dispensation. For example, Hezekiah, the virtuous, needed small outlays for food while the wicked Pekah, beset by a gargantuan appetite, needed huge outlays (487). One's very solicitude about the future should render one that much the readier to help someone whose privation is not of the future but already of today (841). Since that person might die of hunger, failure to help him is homicide.³⁴

Again, if there is no dependability in wealth, one might as well devote it to charity as part with it by evil chance (1626).

Finally, the one who cites heavy taxes as a reason for not giving merely betrays his infidelity to the teaching in Giṭ. 7a³⁵ that, as one's material fortunes decline, one should not reduce one's contributions but should augment them (524). A bad person's small loss looks large and that makes him diminish his charitable gifts, while a righteous person sees, in financial loss, a sin purge for which he praises God (1449). For the rich who decline to assist the poor, there is no expiation (1472).

J. To argument eleven, that charity is to be avoided in order that the remunerative wealth with its perils might be avoided, the reply is afforded by the words of Abot 5.16, "He who will not give and does not wish others to give is a wicked man" (1411). Notwithstanding his apprehensions about wealth, he is a rascal. The fact is that, from the doing of benevolence, no injury results either directly or indirectly. Benevolence is a preventive of every untoward vicissitude (411).

At this point, it may be well to pause and notice the doctrine of the self-prophylaxis of charity as distinguished from that of the rewards of charity. The thought is that, aside from any Divine payment for the deed, there exists a Divine protection against the perils incidental to the deed (1316, 1555). The doctrine of replenishment—*yašlim ḥesrono*—as distinguished from

³⁴ See XI, p. 551.

³⁵ See XI, p. 529.

that of a remunerative augmentation of one's wealth, belongs here (230).³⁶ For example, Cant. 7.3 is allowed to convey that, just as the moon ultimately becomes filled out, so will whatever diminution of property the philanthropist suffers be Divinely indemnified (1618). Of like tenor is the simile of the cistern which retains its level no matter how much the water withdrawn (1472).³⁷

But the doctrine of replenishment is not the only form which this teaching assumes. Thus, the priest who, at the altar, granted the poor sacrificiant precedence over King Agrippa suffered no punishment for his violation of the rules (527).³⁸ Some sages, on a mission of benevolence after nightfall, being accosted by demons were able, by quoting Prov. 21.14a, to outargue the demons and to rout them (175).³⁹ Abba Taḥna, who, in Eccl. r. 40, paused to assist a leper might have incurred all of the embarrassments incidental to a desecration of the Sabbath (1328), but God delayed the sunset that the saint might escape that reproach. According to a passage quoted from a Midrash, one need not fear contagion when visiting the sick, except in times of pestilence (1485A).⁴¹ The author of the *Me'il Zedaqah* appends that, even in times of pestilence, the performer of that

³⁶ On the doctrine of replenishment, XI, p. 529.

³⁷ This differs from the simile of the well (494) in which the more the water yielded, the more the water acquired. See XI, p. 530.

³⁸ See XI, p. 527.

³⁹ The story does not exist in precisely that form. In Yer. Šeq. V, 4, the hero is Hinenah b. Pappa. In Yer. Pe'ah VIII, 1, he is Hananiah b. Pappa. The encounter, in both passages, is with the demon chief.

⁴⁰ Eccl. r. IX, 4 of the Third Seder.

⁴¹ A painstaking search for the source of this Midrash proved unavailing. The text in 1485A gives the source as "*ibid.* p. 50" (שם כ"ט). The reference immediately preceding is to the '*Amudeha Šibe'ah*' (Steinschneider, *Catalog. Bodl.* Col. 799, No. 4594). The reference preceding that is to the *Yalkuṭ* to Proverbs. The reference preceding that is named in paragraph 1475 as the *Derek Ḥayyim*. A most careful search of these works has failed to disclose the passage quoted in 1485A. It may be well to recall here XI, note 8 regarding unused numbers in the paragraph enumerations. The paragraph just before 1485A is 1482. Can it be that the "*ibid.* p. 50" of 1485A refers to some work mentioned in a now missing paragraph 1483 or 1484? The writer of this article will welcome any assistance in locating the source of the citation with which 1485A opens.

meritorious act is immune, provided he does not sit down but remains standing. The observation also occurs that one is miraculously kept from losing flesh when undergoing a fast the savings from which are reserved for the needy (1664). Loss of flesh may lead to sin and the benevolent are safeguarded against that hazard. The presence of a wayfarer in the house tends to impede family growth by interfering with cohabitation (1656). But that consequence is Divinely averted. In fact, God's reasons for blessing a hospitable home by filling it with children are manifold, one of the reasons being that those children themselves become instruments of Divine protection against such dangers as benevolence might entail (1656). Children forestall the impropriety of their mother's being alone with the wayfarer before the arrival of her husband. If damage befalls furniture or utensils because of the stranger's presence, the woman need not undergo her husband's upbraiding. She has the children whom she can hold responsible. As Gen. r. 73.4 says: "Before a woman gets children, her husband blames all household damage on her; after there are children, the blame passes to the child." Thus is a woman bulwarked, by children Divinely sent, against any wrath which household damage incident to the entertainment of strangers may excite in her spouse (1656). It was a miraculous turn of events that shielded a woman from her misanthropic husband's rage when she concealed the wayfarer from him by putting the stranger in the attic (685).⁴²

One need not, accordingly, be deterred from doing kindness by any dread of "stumbling" (1667). The letters following the respective letters of the word *hesed* "kindness" form the word

⁴² See XI, pp. 523, 561. The *Me'il Zedakah* records, however, some lamentable exceptions to the rule. No protective miracle rescued the kind hearted Sodomite maiden (241, 1286). See XI, p. 549, note 86 and XI, pp. 551, 560. Unprotected likewise was the woman who baked the coin in the dough (635, 1207). See XI, p. 546, note 85. Her very act of kindness betrayed her into the false oath which resulted in the death of her child. Noah, according to the *Yalkut Re'ubeni* (Warsaw 1883, p. 137) was injured while caring for the animals in the ark (1316, 1708). Nor are the benevolent spared the ordeal of suffering sympathetically the miseries of the poor to whom they minister (496). See XI, p. 549.

ta'ah "to err." Only through error does one learn how to perform deeds of kindness properly.⁴³ Thus does the *Me'il Zedaqah* elaborate on the doctrine in Pes. 8b, "Injury never befalls those on meritorious mission bent," although the *Me'il Zedaqah* nowhere quotes that passage. It prefers the abundant use of Eccl. 8.5, "Whoso keepeth the commandment shall know no evil thing" (1656).⁴⁴

K. The twelfth argument claims that the poor are too numerous for our resources and that only the blind and the lame should be aided, while the able-bodied should be required to work. This is another one of those fiendish twistings of logic peculiar to the serpent's brood (1565, 1745). The demand that the able-bodied go to work is on a par with that dastardly remark excoriated in Lev. r. 34.4, 7, "What shanks, what loins, what a paunch, what avoirdupois, why not work?" (157, 1693).⁴⁵ How crafty and disingenuous that reference to the blind and the lame (37)! The blind and the lame, unable to go forth seeking alms, obtain no alms (1565). The vipers who spew that stuff have not the remotest intention of helping the blind and the lame. That jabber is only an entering wedge for their entire train of diabolical chicaneries.

That one's possessions do not diminish as a result of chari-

⁴³ Dr. Jacob Mann, whose assistance the author of this article has found indispensable, advises that the text which reads: *אִם בְּחַלְתּוֹ* should be emended to read: *אִם טַעָה בְּחַלְתּוֹ*.

⁴⁴ The principle is the same as that which the *Me'il Zedaqah* applies to a matter falling outside the domain of *Zedaqah*, namely that of scruple about cohabitation during the menstrual period (1656). The man who is punctilious in the observance of this law will be safeguarded against the disadvantages which he risks by reason of his fidelity. The disadvantage is that of begetting females rather than males. The protracted period of abstinence intensifies the man's sex desires. This in turn tends, during sexual intercourse, to hasten his orgasm. Now, if the husband's orgasm occurs before that of the wife, the resultant child will be female. The child will be male*only if the woman's orgasm occur first. But God shields the observer of menstrual abstinence from this drawback. Despite the man's sexual intensity, God delays his ejaculation so that the wife is the first to pass the climax of the cohabitation, thus ensuring that the offspring will be a boy (1656).

⁴⁵ See XI, p. 565.

table giving is what this claptrap, like so many other arguments against benevolence, overlooks (1745).

And what if one is able to contribute only a small amount? In benevolence, every little counts (616, 758, 1351, 1710), as Baba Meṣia 31b apprises us (1332). Even if one's gift be insufficient for the applicant's wants, it will elicit from others additional gifts adequate to meet those wants (1332). That, in fact, is one of the significations of the word "little" alongside of *Ṣedaḳah* in Prov. 16.8 (1710). The meaning is that many small gifts aggregate into an appreciable total; a combination of small sums is a big sum (758). Just as, in the Temple of old, a meal offering would, under certain circumstances, be as valuable as an ox, so today, a devoutly given small donation can avail as a large one (845, 1288). If a person sincerely intends to contribute a talent but is able to contribute only a pound (1291), that pound, in the hands of the treasurer, has the import of a talent. One is rewarded for what one wishes to grant, although the amount actually furnished is smaller. Therefore do not say, "I would give, if I could give adequately" (1351). A *Peruṭah* may supply the second *Peruṭah* needed for a loaf (1351) and tip the scales between life and death (481). Even if one can give nothing but a morsel of bread, one should not withhold that morsel (410). A morsel can sustain life and the giving thereof become the fulfilment of all three parts of Scripture.⁴⁶ One who hands a tenth of a *Peruṭah* to a poor person already holding nine *Peruṭot* obtains the Divine reward of having conferred all ten of them (1568). The ten can purchase the life-saving bread supply.⁴⁷ And, inasmuch as a life was snatched from destruction, the reward of having given all ten goes to every individual who contributed any one of the ten (1568). That is the point to the interpretation of Isa. 59.17 in Baba Batra 9b. *Ṣedaḳah* does resemble a coat of mail. One link missing enables a deadly spear or arrow to gain entrance (1568). Similarly the want of one *Peruṭah* may open access to starvation. If one lacks gold, silver is in place (1595).

⁴⁶ See XI, p. 514.

⁴⁷ In 1351, the loaf costs only two *Peruṭot*.

L. Argument thirteen—that, if one does not help the poor, others will help—is easily refuted (1124, 1600). Were that notion to seize the mind of everyone, nothing would await the poor except starvation (1124). The mere possibility of starvation imposes the duty of helping just as, in the cities of refuge (Deut. 19.5), the mere possibility that the refugee was innocent, entitled him to asylum. Moreover, Lev. 25.35 says, “*Thou shalt uphold him*” (1600). *Thou shalt do it. Do not leave it to others.*

M. To argument fourteen, which is essentially that of Tinnius Rufus (1492),⁴⁸ the answer is that God does indeed help the poor but that the human helper is God’s agent or deputy (1627). While God is obligated, literally, to do good to His creatures, human beings are His tools (1714). Of those who quote Deut. 11.12 to justify their uncharitableness, Amos 5.7 speaks the condemnatory words that they cast *Zedaḳah* “upon the ground” or, rather, upon the land (*’areṣ*). That is, by referring to the land in Deut. 11.12, they excuse their unwillingness to aid the impoverished (968).

THE POOR ARE GOD’S FAVORITES

The argument that God hates the poor (argument number fifteen)⁴⁹ is utterly without basis. To the contrary, God cherishes the poor (745, 1370, 1435, 1449, 1697). The word *hesed* contains the initials of the sentence, *ḥannun somek dallim* “The Compassionate One sustaineth the needy” (1464). In one paragraph of the *Me’il Zedaḳah*, no fewer than thirty reasons are assembled explaining the preciousness of the poor in the sight of the Lord (1140).

The voice of the poor is pleasant unto the Lord (1675). God loves the wisdom of the poor, because God appreciates the intrinsic worth of wisdom (1675). God is, by all means, fond of the poor for their part in causing people to devote attention to the Torah (1331).⁵⁰ One of the numerous significations derived from emending *gebul ’olam* in Prov. 22.28 to *gebul ’olim* is that

⁴⁸ See XI, p. 541 and *infra* p. 663.

⁴⁹ *Supra* p. 637.

⁵⁰ *Supra* p. 640.

the poor are *'olim*, exalted in God's esteem (1515). The poor, disdained by the wicked are, in God's eyes, priests the sons of priests (1409).

Again, one of the many implications of the fact that the letters of *'ani* "poor" are the same as those of *'ayin* "eye" is that the poor are ever under the solicitous eye Divine (1341, 1407). A synonym for "poor" is *mak*, the word which contains the initials of the sentence *mebazzeh kabod*, recording how a poor person's relatives feel ashamed of him (1341). But this, in turn reminds one of the Midrash that, unlike man who shuns his poor relatives, God does not shun the poor (1341).⁵¹ A poor man's hand may, in the words of Lev. 25.35, "fail" with his kindred but, with God, his hand is high (1597). Through affliction, his worth before God is enhanced. Others may despise the poor, but the Lord lavishes upon them His Shekinah (1675). Especially the object of Divine affection is the class of the poor called *'ani*, the most wretched of the biblical eight types (1468).⁵² And supremely dear to God are the poor who bear their miseries without complaint (934).

The contrary notion, that poverty evinces God's dislike of the poor is without foundation. How can the poor be objects of the Divine displeasure (1522)? Even in Messianic times, when all men will know God, some people are still going to be necessitous.⁵³

Poverty, be it remembered, is not something that God ordains but something due to the star under which one is born⁵⁴ and this, in turn, is determined by the date of the parental act of procreation (1696).

If God does send poverty, His purpose is to make the individual turn from sin or to afford others the opportunity to acquire merit by almsgiving (1611). It were also well to say that the sufferings of the poor are attributable not to any Divine

⁵¹ Ex. r. 31, 12. Tanḥumah *Mišpaṭim* 9.

⁵² *Infra* p. 638, note 132, the lowest stratum is that of the *'ebyon*. Also in paragraphs 906 and 940.

⁵³ They will be gentiles, according to 895, 1336, and 1522. According to 1573, they will be converts to Judaism.

⁵⁴ See XI, p. 565.

disfavor but rather to God's inscrutable decree (1522). God does not dislike the poor (1611, 1696). He is only as a father chastising a son (1696).

Upon the poor, the Shekinah rests (720) because of their lowliness (957), while it avoids the high and the mighty (745). Indeed, all tribulation brings one nearer the Divine (1399). This is illustrated by the case of the sage who, for exposing the vices of a reputable person and proclaiming the virtues of a disreputable one, incurred public disfavor (1399). But his face grew brighter with every word he spoke and he ultimately attained the Shekinah (1399). While the Shekinah is averse to sojourning in a mind that is melancholy, the poor form an exception (106, 609). Their sad minds do receive the Shekinah. The Shekinah's favorites are the wise, the pious, the afflicted, the sick, the needy (1489).

Inevitably, God is nigh unto the poor (510). He stands alongside of them (1365). He is at their right hand (1697). He prefers them to the rich (1246).

The gates and windows of heaven are always open to their prayers (693, 736). Before God's throne, those prayers take precedence over all others (1267). Just as there is on high a shrine of prophecy and a shrine of reverence, there is also a shrine of the needy (1122). While the other shrines may, on occasion, be accessible to someone who is imperfectly qualified, it is not thus with the shrine of the poor (1122). Only by the pious poor, with their praying shawls and phylacteries, may that particular shrine be approached (1122). A certain door of Heaven is ajar only to them (1313).

The crudeness of a poor person's supplications presents no obstacles (949). Prayers are heard, however faltering (346, 542, 669, 946). God does not insist that the diction of prayers be ornate (346, 669). God hears prayers no matter how the language is marred by want and trouble (945, 946). A petition is heard though uttered with wandering thoughts (946). The mere extending of the hand suffices with God, if the suppliant is too harried to pray otherwise (946). Especially does God hearken unto the prayers of one who, despite hardships, devotes himself to the Torah (542). As the worshiper is indifferent to his own

comfort, God is indifferent to the niceties of devotional phraseology (542). God does not reject prayers even when those reciting them fail to understand the sense or the correct pronunciation of the Hebrew (1667); the respective letters of the word *hesed*, God's kindness, precede the letters of the verb *ta'ah*, the word for the worshippers' errors (1667). Sometimes a poor person's mere cry is heeded, no matter what the intent of the cry (1468). This obtains particularly with the '*ani*, the most pitiable of the eight biblical types.⁵⁵ In fact, to ensure the hearing of one's prayers, one must imitate King David who, eager to have his prayers accepted, lived in the manner of the penniless (693, 736).

In Lev. 14.21, God excuses the poor from costly burnt offerings (883). Where God exacts an ox from the rich, a sheep suffices for the needy (641). And when a poor person brings a sin-offering, a heavenly voice announces the fact (1339); and properly so, because the poor man's sacrifice is dual. It includes the immolation of his own flesh and blood (1728). On a certain occasion, a poor man's offering of herbs proved more acceptable than a rich man's ox (528). Inasmuch as the ox ate the herbs, the herbs became, to the poor man's credit, part of the ox. What wonder that sometimes the rich desire the poor person's status (1307)!

God singles out the poor for His acts of deliverance (1565). The letters of the word *misken*, one of the eight biblical synonyms in Lev. r. 34.6, constitute the initials of the sentence *mesabbeḥ sibbot konen nishmato*, "The Cause of causes sustaineth his soul" (1341). Ignored as they are of men, the needy would perish, did not God hold them in His care (904).

God favors the poor in time of drought and plague (151). It is true that, in famines which God inflicts owing to the sins of the haughty, some of the poor perish (1330). But the poor who succumb die because their time to die has arrived: while the other poor, thanks to God's care, survive. In time of drought, woe unto the wealthy (151)!

Only through God's special attention, did the poor of Israel live through the hardships of the diaspora (962). The letters of

⁵⁵ In 906, 940, 1548 and 1643, not the '*ani* but the '*ebyon* is at the lowest depths. See *supra* note 52 and *infra* note 132.

the word 'ebyon are the initials of: 'en ba'al-nes yode'a umakkir nisso, which means that incomprehensible to the poor themselves is the miracle of their preservation (1341). Again, when Zion is redeemed, the first to be redeemed will be her poor (1720).

Possibly another evidence of the Divine partiality is noted when the *Me'il Zedaḳah* dwells upon the passage in Ta'anit 8b which comments on the graciousness of the sun toward the poor, if the sun shines on the Sabbath (672). A time will come when the sun will always shine on the Sabbath, thus counter-acting the ills to which the poor are exposed by the day's change of regimen (1643).

Nor are these the only ways in which God shows His favoritism (1246). God will exalt the poor (913, 1608). He will raise them from the lowest depths directly to the loftiest heights, as He once lifted Joseph (948). One paragraph of the *Me'il Zedaḳah* lists fourteen particulars in which the poor are Divinely glorified (1608). God will enable the poor to vanquish the wicked (927). For the sake of the poor, He suspends His mercy and substitutes His severity (956). Let the hour arrive for aiding the poor and He will bring down the eyes of the haughty (929). Five times did David urge God to arise⁵⁶ but God consented to do so (Psalm 12.6) only "for the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy" (524, 1140.16, 1372).⁵⁷ That God is roused to action by the cry of the poor is shown by the fact that the word *Zedaḳah* contains the initials of the sentence, *za'akat dallim kayyemet hašekinah*, "the cry of the poor maketh the Shekinah stand up" (1464).

God loves the poor even when He declines to grant them the wealth they desire that they might cultivate sacred learning the more intensively (1675, 1695). He withholds the wealth because He foresees that prosperity might lead to sin and to godlessness

⁵⁶ Psalms 3.7; 7.6; 44.26; 68.1; 102.13.

⁵⁷ In 1372, God is actuated by an ulterior motive. God declines to arise for David because the deliverance would, in that event, be attributed to the power of human royalty. When God arises for the poor, the Divine intervention can not fail of recognition.

(1675).⁵⁸ Those who are fettered by want may be, in a sense, prisoners but, as Psalm 69.34 says, they are *His* prisoners (1695). They are not the objects of His scorn.

Naturally, when God would inspire Israel with hope, He speaks of them as poor, honoring and cheering them by that appellative (961). The *mazzah* on Passover amounts to our praying, "Lord, deem us as the poor, Thy beloved" (1356).

A glorious hereafter (944) and a throne of splendor (957) await those who, in this world, endure their hardships with fortitude. David himself donned the garb of poverty in order to qualify for seeing God in the hereafter (474). To him who, despite privation pursues his sacred studies, the heavenly curtain will not be closed (542). The devotees of learning who are poor here below will abound in wealth on high (482). Where the saying in Abot 4.11 fails of realization that "He who cultivates the Torah in poverty will come to cultivate it in opulence," the reason is that the true reward is reserved for the Beyond (1609). Among the numerous reasons why the letters of '*ani* "poor" and of '*ayin* "eye" are the same is the fact that the poor are destined for rewards which no eye hath seen except the eye of God (1409). And one of the reasons why, in Lev. 23, verse 22 interrupts the list of festival prescriptions is the fact that they who gather *leket*, *shikhah* and *pe'ah* in this world will feast in the world supernal (1433). In heaven, where the exalted of earth are brought low (1753), the poor are enriched and raised high (1341). That is why the poor yearns for death, the very letters of the word '*ani* "poor" containing the initials of '*ad yezi'at nishmato*, "for his soul's going forth" (1341).

One of the many implications of emending Prov. 22.28, to read *gebul* '*olim* is that the poor are '*olim*, ascending to heaven at once, exempt from the intervening torments (1515). Theirs will be the reward and the wealth of deliverance from Gehenna (524, 917, 930, 932, 953 Lemberg edit., 1341, 1385, 1409).⁵⁹ This is also among the nine reasons for the position of verse 22 in Lev. 23. Chapter 23 deals with holidays (1433). But "holidays"

⁵⁸ Sometimes it is only lack of means that keeps a person from sinning (741, 1124). See XI, p. 564, note 107.

⁵⁹ On poverty as the substitute for Gehenna, XI, p. 561.

is a designation for "scholars." Like the scholars, the poor mentioned in verse 22 are exempt from Gehenna. Purified by suffering as if they were blind and lame, they are immune to Gehenna (1398).⁶⁰ Through its atoning poverty, Israel is preserved from Gehenna (524, 943), even as it is entitled to be spared subjugation in matters political (524).

The merits of the poor are not the Deity's only reason for favoring them. There is the additional reason that the Deity, an exile from Palestine, is Himself poor (840, 1143) and lowly (1360 answer 8, 745). The Shekinah is poor (693, 1140.15, 1356, 1446, 1675), expatriated (1143) and possessing naught (1394, 1583). The Messiah is poor (956, 1595). According to an intricate *gimatria* playing on the word *dal*, the Deity was poor at least before the world was created, whatever may have been His munificence since (1446): while, according to Cabalistic speculation, the Shekinah possesses naught except what is bestowed upon it by the *Ze'er 'Anpin* (693). Similar indigence is predicated of various Cabalistic hypostases such as the *Malkut* (1312, 1475) which, in its poverty, is paradoxically different from *Malkut* in the worldly sense of "kingdom" (1372). There is also the Cabalistic *Keter* hypostasizing the Divine humility (1463).⁶¹

Again, God loves the poor because the poor are persecuted and God sides with the persecuted (1140.29). God also loves the poor in order to demonstrate how He differs from human beings who avoid the poor person except when they need him (1140.26). The mental confusion suffered by the poor is a further reason for His Divine intervention (920).⁶²

Thus it is utterly fallacious to argue that one commits a sin when one helps the poor (1522). If one helps, God can not be displeased (1696). The very word *Ḥesed* contains the initials of the phrase, *ḥakam somek dallim*, "the wise sustaineth the needy;"

⁶⁰ The contrary thought also occurs, that poverty, with its distractions and the missing of Torah study which it occasions, deters from the felicity hereafter (1690).

⁶¹ Elsewhere God is represented as wealthy (612, 626). See XI, p. 517, note 29. One of the reasons why prophets and priests had to be wealthy was that they represented God Who is wealthy. On the poverty of the Shekinah, XI, p. 540.

⁶² See XI, p. 562.

while the word *Zedakah* is composed of the initials of *zofeh dallim kadoš hu'*, "Whoso regardeth the poor is holy" (1464).

It follows that one should repudiate, with utmost vigor, the pernicious words of them who oppose the practice of charity (1442).

UNCHARITABLENESS IS VICIOUS

Although we have considered the causes, the consequences and the penalties of uncharitableness, as well as the crooked reasonings of its apostles, we have, by no means, exhausted the list of its damnable attributes. Much more remains to be said. As charity amounts to the equivalent of everything that Judaism lauds,⁶³ uncharitableness is the composite of everything that Judaism stigmatizes (511). Uncharitableness is a violation of the entire Torah (1348). It comprises robbery, murder, idolatry, heresy, atheism and hostility toward God. To be a misanthrope is to break all of the Ten Commandments (1632).

Whoever is indifferent to the poor becomes guilty of the thefts, the frauds, and the other crimes to which poverty drives the poor (1341). The poor person himself is the victim of robbery when one discontinues one's customary and expected gifts (81, 391, 1572), such being all that a poor person possesses of which he can be robbed (1572). Besides, the rich, as we have already noted,⁶⁴ are only the stewards (495). Their money is in reality the poor people's money. Hence the speculation of withholding it.

One can understand why uncharitableness is so frequently identified with murder (1330)⁶⁵ when one recalls the fatal consequences of uncharitableness (1451).⁶⁶ We need not be at all surprised that fasting, unattended by alms, is called bloodshed (435, 644, 1214);⁶⁷ or that the elders in Deut. 21.7 use the words "our hands have not shed this blood" to convey (according to Sot. 46b) that they had not been delinquent in charitableness

⁶³ See XI, pp. 513-515.

⁶⁴ See XI, pp. 551, 552.

⁶⁵ See XI, p. 552.

⁶⁶ See XI, p. 551.

⁶⁷ On *ta'anit* and *tel 'ani*, XI, pp. 513, 552.

toward the victim of the murder under their cognizance (14, 678). "Pity the poor, comfort the mourners, visit the sick, bury the dead," say the *Azharot* (1348). The connection is that, if one fails to pity a poor person, he dies and his survivors become mourners. Fail to comfort the mourners: they fall ill. Fail to visit them in their illness: the result is death—untimely death (*nigzarim*)—and thus one causes the death not of an individual but of an entire household. That remissness in helping the poor is homicide is also one of the many thoughts extracted from a comparison between the auspicious two-legged ׀ and the sinister one-legged ׀ (1451).

Uncharitableness is likewise idolatry (34, 381, 1129, 1219, 1220, 1348, 1370, 1492, 1519). It violates the command, in Ex. 20.20, against making gods of silver or of gold (381). It betrays an attitude identical with that of the idolater Tinnius Rufus (1492).⁶⁸ To "hide one's eyes from benevolence" (Baba Batra 10a) is to imitate not God, the All-Seeing but the idols in Psalm 115.5 which "have eyes but do not see" (1370). Another point of similarity is stressed by Maimonides when he observes that, while Scripture (Ezek. 14.5) is concerned about one's innermost thoughts regarding idolatry, the same solicitude about the innermost thoughts (Deut. 15.9) arises regarding benevolence (1370). It is also to be noted that when, through generosity, one becomes an imitator of God,⁶⁹ one exemplifies that likeness between man and God for which the words in Gen. 1.27 are *bezelem Elohim* (1492). When one is derelict as to charity, the *Elohim* drops out and there remains only *zelem*, an image used in idolatrous worship (1492).

The very fundamentals of Judaism are negated when charity is not practiced (1394, 1501, 1540). To decline to render an act of kindness either to the rich or to the poor is to controvert an essential of the Jewish faith (1322, 1394). Inasmuch as the world was built on kindness,⁷⁰ not to exemplify kindness amounts to the hersey of denying creation (1322). Such conduct is also a controverting of the truth that God gives to each its food in

⁶⁸ See XI, p. 541 and *supra* p. 655.

⁶⁹ See XI, pp. 515, 516.

⁷⁰ See XI, p. 523.

its season and that He devotes three hours daily to feeding all creatures from unicorn to insect (1511).⁷¹ Unbelief of this kind is notoriously the trait of those who, having food for today, fear for tomorrow and hesitate to spend money either for benevolence or for proper Sabbath garments or for suitable holiday fare (1511). Such conduct further betrays the notion that a person's wealth is of his own acquiring and that God has nothing to do with giving it or taking it away (1370). As the phrase in Baba Batra 10a, "hiding one's eyes from benevolence," intimates, uncharitableness contradicts the teaching that God discerns our secret intentions (1370). Even on his deathbed, the confirmed misanthrope exposes his addiction to the pagan idea that there is nothing after death and that, like a tree which withers, man ceases to exist (1382). Otherwise he would, through almsgiving, seek to shield himself from doom. If he believes in a hereafter, would he be such a fool as to leave his wealth to others while he neglects his own soul? What unbelief such a person divulges when, though in sound mind, he makes bequests which aim to keep his children from quarreling with one another rather than to keep their departing souls from collision with the demons that fill the air (1382)!

Failure to aid the poor is also polytheism (1370). It implies that the God Who created the poor is not the same as the God Who created the well-to-do. Such callousness is also atheism. To be sceptical about God's restoring what one gives⁷² is to be sceptical about God Himself (1304). Since all of our possessions are vouchsafed us that we might assist our fellow men (1394)—above all, our impoverished fellow men (1393)—it follows that, for our possessions, we are indebted to our fellow men. Refusal to assist is thus an ungrateful ignoring of a debt. It is an obliviousness of the good which we have received from human beings and hence a step toward a denial of the good which we have received from God (1394). But a denial of God's goodness is a denial of God Himself. Thus, not only failure to tithe (577)⁷³ but all uncharitableness indicates disbelief in God's existence (1289). Not even scholarship effaces the atheism of one who

⁷¹ See XI, p. 516.

⁷² See XI, p. 529, also *supra* p. 649.

⁷³ See XI, p. 516.

defaults at *gemilut hasadim* (651, 1199, 1202, 1360 answer to question 1). Such scholarship is godless scholarship (1346).

That uncharitableness is even an assault upon God may justly be asserted. Since "whoso is gracious unto the poor lendeth unto the Lord,"⁷⁴ ungraciousness is a dishonoring of the Lord (1370, 1492, 1504). It is an omitting of the honor due the Lord (1501). It is an aggression upon the dignity of the Lord because it does nothing to allay the murmurings of the poor against the Lord (1501). It keeps God exposed to attack, blasphemy and vilification (1370).⁷⁵ It is also rebellion against God (1144). Whoso thrusts at the poor today will be thrusting at God tomorrow (1393). Since the poor are God's beloved,⁷⁶ hating the poor is hating God; for he who hates the king's favorites hates the king himself (1370). The poor being God's troops, he who ignores the poor withholds supplies, as it were, from the monarch's soldiers, and thus affronts the monarch (1501). To disdain the poor is to condemn the Shekinah associated with the poor (1616B).

We should notice that the numerical aggregate of the first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet is ten (1202). The symbol for ten is י. The fifth letter of the alphabet is ה. The letters י and ה form the name of God. Omit any one of the first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet and the Divine Name is deleted. But when one fails to succor the needy, one omits two of those letters, namely י and ה which, according to the clever school children in Šab. 104a, signify *gemul dallim*, "assist the poor" (1202). What stronger proof can one ask that through indifference to the poor even by one who cultivates learning, the Divine suffers mutilation? One antagonizes God, if one so much as harbors a dog which frightens the poor away (1224).

THE UNCHARITABLE TYPES

We have already observed what types of people are the charitable ones.⁷⁷ We now notice the types of those who are not charitable, such as the hard-hearted, the misers, the usurers,

⁷⁴ On the quotation from Prov. 19.17, XI, p. 517, note 30.

⁷⁵ On the murmurings of the poor, XI, pp. 517, 563.

⁷⁶ *Supra* pp. 655-661.

⁷⁷ See XI, pp. 557-561.

the avaricious and the evil-eyed, the unwise and the gentiles. To this group belong also the unmanly and the unhuman.

Among the uncharitable, are the bad-hearted (1219). Badness of heart is something *pasul* like a shriveled *etrog*.⁷⁸ That slackness about *leket*, *šikkah*, and *pe'ah* indicates an evil heart, is one of the ideas conveyed by the position of Lev. 23.22 between the accounts of the two sets of holy seasons (1433). Especially is an evil, "uncircumcised" heart betrayed when alms are omitted on a fast day (1523).

Other types of non-givers are the misers and the skinflints (375, 382, 383, 384). Compared with these, even the parsimonious are munificent (1738). The miser is willing to concede something to the poor, but it must be stingy and paltry like that which he provides for himself (1738). Solomon prayed that money might come not to the miser but to the magnanimous (573). The miser has already been mentioned⁷⁹ as one of those who argue in the vein of Tinnius Rufus that God hates the poor and that non-giving therefore represents the real compliance with the Divine will (1738).

The miser violates all of the Ten Commandments (1632).⁸⁰ He not only declines to give; he reviles the person who solicits his giving (382). When misers get together, their conversation is a ridiculing of the generous (384). A sage was once asked to cite an example of an incurable wound (374). He replied that an incurable wound is a situation in which a large hearted person needs aid from a miser, which aid, of course, will never be forthcoming (374).

The usurer also figures in this class, pettily carping when asked for some charitable assistance (745). Avarice likewise plays its role (1590),⁸¹ as well as the evil eye displayed, according to Lev. r. 34, 4, 7, when one admonishes a suppliant for relief, "what shanks, what loins, what a paunch, what avoirdupois, why not work?" (157),⁸² which is plainly a casting of the evil

⁷⁸ On the *etrog*, XI, pp. 530, 532, note 59.

⁷⁹ *Supra* pp. 637, 655, and 663.

⁸⁰ *Supra* p. 662.

⁸¹ See XI, p. 550.

⁸² See XI, p. 565.

eye upon that poor person's physical assets. Also among the uncharitable are the unwise (1464).

To be uncharitable is also to be un-Jewish. The uncharitable are not of Abraham's seed (500, 1578, 1632) which is compassionate and kindly (1523, 1578, 1632, 1658).⁸³ They are not of the lineage on which God has placed His name but of the cruel gentile lineage. That the Jews are modest, sympathetic and kindly is expressed by the very name *Yisra'el*, divisible into *yašar* and *'El*, "being right with God" (1658). The uncharitable Jews so far resemble gentiles that they ought to be accorded the legal status of gentiles (1632). They behave like the mixed multitude (Ex. 12.38) from which they are descended (503, 1565). Even when a Jew fails to give *Zedaqaḥ* actually, he is a giver potentially (1601). Gentiles, on the other hand, are like iron, one end of which remains cool though the other end glows (522). They are unhelpful and unsympathetic toward one another. Israel is like gold which transmits heat rapidly throughout its entire mass (522, 660).⁸⁴ The Jews are so unified that compassion with one another is like self-compassion (1578).

The uncharitable is also womanish (1193, 1198), although elsewhere in the *Me'il Zedaqaḥ*, the beneficence of woman is extolled.⁸⁵ The soul of the uncharitable man must have been female in some previous incarnation. Most inappropriate is it for such a man to recite the prayer, *šelo 'asani iššah*.

Uncharitableness is also bestial. Since man was created for the purpose of *Zedaqaḥ*, it is the performance of *Zedaqaḥ* that makes a man human (1662). Compassion so characterises human nature that lack of compassion brands one as an animal (1308). In other words, the fact that charity is man's natural impulse renders uncharitableness all the more disgraceful (555).⁸⁶ A person is not human unless he puts *Zedaqaḥ* before him constantly (1668).⁸⁷ This is indicated by the fact that the letters ו"ח"ק.—which are the letters respectively following the several letters of

⁸³ See XI, p. 550.

⁸⁴ See XI, p. 554, note 91.

⁸⁵ See XI, p. 531, note 58 and p. 560.

⁸⁶ See XI, p. 512, note 24 and p. 518, note 33.

⁸⁷ See XI, p. 551.

the word *Zedaḳah*—yield the numerical total of three hundred and eleven. But three hundred and eleven is also the *gimatria* of 'iš, "man" (1668). This proves that one is really a man only when one keeps *Zedaḳah* constantly before him, just as the letters ק"ד"ר"י are constantly before the letters צ"ד"ק"פ. The uncharitable are akin to the wild birds and beasts (678, 1123).⁸⁸ The miser, grasping for himself what would suffice for many, presents the demeanor of a dog (380). The uncharitable, in fact, spring from a demoniac ancestry (500, 1140.20). Their sire is the *Siṭra Aḥera*. They are, as we have stated, the spawn of Lilith and the serpent (1565).

The uncharitable person is, in brief, a villain. This is indicated by the fact that, if we take the ' from the word, 'ašir "wealthy," the result is the letters of raša', the word for "rascal" (1341). That ' depicts the poor person, bent like a ' : wherefore the 'ašir, the wealthy man who neglects the poor is a scoundrel. Especially does this apply to the rogue who not only refuses to give but also deters others from giving (1321) and who rages when he sees others donate liberally (1549). Abandoned, contemptible, abominable, despicable, loathesome—those five qualities of his correspond to the five vicious angels, 'af, mašit, kezef, ḥemah, meḥabbel, which hover near him (1519). It would actually appear that the privilege of rendering charity is vouchsafed to the righteous only (1467).⁸⁹

No wonder that, in the sacred writings, uncharitableness is so roundly condemned. Amos 2.6, reprobating those who "sell . . . the needy for a pair of shoes" alludes to those who fail to provide shoes for people who are without shoes (965); while his denunciation of those who cast *Zedaḳah* to the ground (Amos 5.7) pillories those who would rather spend their money purchasing land (i. e. ground) than use it for the support of scholarship. Poverty-stricken R. Joshua, visited in his grimy abode by Rabban Gamaliel, rebuked his contemporaries for their callousness to his and his fellow scholars' privations (464). The rich whom Rabbi Judah, the Prince, honored were the benevo-

⁸⁸ See XI, p. 551, 553.

⁸⁹ In the Lemberg edition, p. 161d, near bottom.

lent rich not the close-fisted ones, such as those Babylonian Jews who turned a deaf ear to Sabbetai ben Marinos (503).⁹⁰

Even among those who do give, various types can be discriminated, such as the four types of Abot V. 16 (229, 707, 1410, 1411, 1601, 1624). These diversities are further explicated by the simile of nuts (1707). Some nuts are opened easily, some are cracked by pounding and some are hard to crack. Analogously, there are Jews who give without being asked, others give upon being asked, others decline even if asked. The amounts given run parallel. They who give before they are asked give adequately. They who give upon being asked give less than adequately. Some who decline to give when asked give when not asked. In this way they can "get by" with an infinitesimal sum (1707).

A distinction involving no censure is that between the potential giver and the actual giver; just as there is a potential and an actual frequenter of the school house (1601, 1602). The potential doer is he who acts just as soon as insurmountable obstacles are removed.

Then there are those who have been benevolent all their lives as well as those who, not always benevolent, repent and reform so that, in line with Prov. 19.17, they might cleave unto God (1524). The habitually benevolent are the *yode'e zedeḳ* of Isa. 51.7, while the regenerate ones are the *rodefe zedeḳ* of Isa. 51.1. The index of one's habituation is one's willingness (1521).

On the other hand, there are the avaricious whose lust for money inhibits their paying even when they pledge (1321, 1589). Some are so stingy that, when embarrassed into giving, they avail themselves of intermediaries (1374).⁹¹ They expose, in their very manner of giving, their evil hearts and ways. Similar is the crusty individual who, approached by a needy person in public and ashamed to refuse, puts his hand in his purse but is hindered by his evil inclination from drawing it forth (1693).⁹² He has to ask another to take out the coin and

⁹⁰ See XI, p. 557.

⁹¹ Yet this is elsewhere (1262) one of the propaedeutics of benevolence *Infra* p. 690.

⁹² *Ibid.*

present it. Then there are the wealthy tightwads who, with all of their synagogal fanfare, donate paltry sums and "get away with it" even on a holiday (1666). There are those who, unable to endure the ordeal of giving, content themselves with directing the solicitors to other persons who are more likely to give (1416).

There are also such as Abimelech in Gen. 21.22,23, an example of one who performs an act of kindness but does it without spontaneity (859); such is in Gen. 21.23 the sense of the כ in *kehese*d (859). An oneiric visit of God (Gen. 20.3) had to prod him. Then there is the person—he belongs to the "intermediate rank" of Abot V. 16—who imagines that the money which he owns and which he bestows comes from his own efforts when, in reality, it emanates from God's favor (1624). No higher is the rank of him who, while by nature a miser, gives merely because, before God, he is scared (1624).⁹³ Finally, there is the person who gives but whose money is "tainted" (1327).⁹⁴

MOTIVATION UNEXALTED AND EXALTED

All of this leaves no doubt that, for the performance of charity, the reasons are overwhelming, while not one valid reason exists for its neglect. One's own personal wellbeing is so intimately linked with one's benevolence that one may well regard the day which passes without some act of benevolence as one of the "evil days" of Eccl. 12.1 (63).

But self interest is, by no means, the only motivation worth considering. While an endless list⁹⁵ of Divine rewards awaits the benevolent, charity prompted exclusively or excessively by the expectation of those rewards is ignoble. Undue preoccupation with rewards can invite untoward consequences. While reimbursement awaits the contributor,⁹⁶ there are times when, for reasons hidden in the mind of God, reimbursement is delayed (1621). The result can be that a person expecting certain advantages but failing to realize them might renounce *mizwot* altogether (1621).

⁹³ On ulterior motives, *infra* p. 671.

⁹⁴ On "tainted" money, XI, p. 546.

⁹⁵ See XI, p. 545, note 84.

⁹⁶ *Supra* p. 651 and XI, p. 529.

Accordingly, one should forsake ulterior motives (1292). One should imitate not the flesh which receives without giving but the heart which gives without receiving (1500) or one should emulate the Cabalistic "Upper Chariot" with its inexhaustible outpouring (*šefa'*): it receives not but it imparts (1512).⁹⁷ Heaven reserves a special reward for such as ignore rewards and who, in the uncertainty of recouping themselves, perform the *mizwah* for its own sake (1621).⁹⁸

If this applies to Divinely conferred advantages, it certainly applies to mundane advantages. The motive of self-glorification is abominable (1416); display is something to avoid at all hazards (1292). They who scheme, by their benevolences, to obtain *éclat* will lose both their wealth and the honor which rests on wealth (1416). It has been maintained that the motive of self-glorification in Nicodemos ben Gorion accounts for the destitution which befell his daughter (1744).⁹⁹ There are those who give because they shrink from comparing unfavorably with other givers (1292). Some give in order to impress the public. Some give in order to acquire prestige. Some give because they have been shamed into giving (1374). All of these kinds of philanthropy are injurious and profitless (1292).¹⁰⁰ Censurable, above all, is the Ashkenazic custom of publishing a person's benevolences during his *mi*

⁹⁷ It is only in connection with meritorious deeds that one may renounce rewards (1529). One is not free to reject rewards in order to choose a line of conduct that is reprehensible. One may not say: "I shall do evil and forego rewards." "I shall omit *mizwot* and accept Hell." Israel is not free to bargain: "We shall dispense with *mizwot* as well as with the redemption which is the reward of *mizwot*;" just as a woman is not free to stipulate that her husband is exempt from the obligation of ransoming her and that her earnings and the income from her dowry shall go not to her husband but to herself. God is not, like a human king, eager for occasion to inflict punishment.

⁹⁸ Somewhat divergent is the thought based on Baba Batra 10b, that one is a full fledged *Zaddik* even though one says, "I give this coin in order that my children may live" or "that I might enjoy the hereafter" (1564). One who is already a perfect *Zaddik* does not lose that rank by speaking thus. One who is not already a perfect *Zaddik* becomes such by the mere act of philanthropy. The motive may not be the most exalted. But charity is exalted. The poor have been helped.

⁹⁹ See XI, p. 556 on paragraphs 27, 28.

¹⁰⁰ However, Johanan ben Zakkai is quoted to the effect that self glorification in charity is not reprehensible to an inordinate degree (1744).

šeberek at the Torah reading, when sometimes the entire donation of a wealthy giver amounts to a *Peruṭah* (1666). What a contrast with Abraham who declined so much as thanks, urging his guests rather to direct their appreciation to God (1680)! The beautiful thing about the gracious lender is that, strictly speaking, he does not give at all and is therefore less likely, in his benevolences, to resemble the boastful King Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4.27) (1501).

Related to this is the imperativeness of secrecy. In Psalm 106.3a and 3b, the singular of the participle when mentioning *Zedaḳah*—contrasted with the plural participle when the next word is *mišpaṭ*—embodies the thought (1503). Except the object be the setting of a good example, all ostentation jeopardizes the Divine reward (1676). Ostentatious giving amounts not to a genuine but to a causal giving (1292). One of the many ways in which *Zedaḳah* resembles a sowing is that, just as the seed must be hidden from the birds, so must *Zedaḳah* be hidden—for instance, by such an institution as the *liškat hagazit* in Šek. V. 6 (1467). This lesson is also imparted by the way in which God bestowed the manna (1296). The manna descended at the hours of dewfall, hours when none was watching. Among the numerous reasons why the knowers of *Zedaḳah* in Isa. 51.7 are superior to the pursuers of *Zedaḳah* in Isa. 51.1 is the fact that the pursuers hanker after public display (1524). Whoso succors the needy in secret sanctifies God's name in secret and deserves to be called by God's name no less than the one who sanctifies God's name in public (1539). Secret charity is especially effective in warding off the angel of death from the members of one's family (174). According to Baba Batra, 9b, whoso performs benevolence in secret is greater than Moses, our master (1553).

For the insistence upon secrecy, the reasons are varied. One of them is regard for the poor person's sensibilities.¹⁰¹ Another is the possibility that the sight of one's giving might deter others from giving; it might lead people to assume that the poor person's needs are already supplied (847). Another reason is one applicable to tithes and *terumah* (1682). These are allotted when no one is

¹⁰¹ Paragraphs 83, 114, 116, 117, 451, 563, 694, 1220, 1503, 1539, 1553, 1650, 1681.

looking. Honesty in these matters therefore evinces a faith in Divine compensation. Little faith is required to expect a harvest from a literal sowing; abundant faith is needed when the harvest is the remote one of *Zedaqah* (1682). Yet another reason for secrecy is the avoidance of despicable motives (1292). "Before the assembly for charitable collection convenes, one should at home in solitude within one's own heart, take counsel with one's Maker, how much one should give. Let one donate purely for the sake of the good deed, excluding all ulterior motives. One should bring that sum to the assembly and give it to the treasurer. By designating that sum when alone with one's Maker, one avoids the ostentation of pledging in public" (1292). In this way, one achieves three distinct *mizwot*, (a), the designating, (b) the bringing, (c) the handing over. But the exclusion of unworthy motives is the outstanding feature.

We can thus understand why the righteous are averse to having their merits published (1328). An example was Aaron ben Shoshan who ordered his agent to provide anonymously for many necessitous families (1553). Only the stoppage of those allowances at his death disclosed the giver.¹⁰²

The gentiles are frequently cited in the *Me'il Zedaqah* as specimens not only of deficient benevolence¹⁰³ but also of utili-

¹⁰² One may, however, inscribe one's name on an object donated to a synagogue or a school (1214). Again, one may give openly to induce giving by others (1676, 1681). Giving to a woman must not be clandestine lest suspicion arise (1681). The woman will, despite the obviousness of her need, incur suspicion. She might, in fact, court it deliberately, because of the humiliation of admitting that she was the recipient of alms. While a man may expose himself to suspicion and then forgive his maligners, he may not thus expose another. When giving to a woman, one must close one's eyes (1567). As Ber. 61a states, whoso looks at a woman while trading with her will go to Hell, though he be learned and otherwise as virtuous as Moses, our Master. Obeying these prohibitions assures one of security both here and hereafter. One's house should stand open to the poor but, when a poor woman comes, the man must forbear to engage in extensive conversation with her. Therefore, "says Elijah Cohen, the author," one's wife shall assist poor women, while the man of the house assists poor men. Or, if necessary, the money can be carried to a poor woman by one's maid servant or by one's young son.

¹⁰³ *Supra* p. 667.

tarian benevolence. That is why Job, the gentile, was omitted from the list of charity exemplars in the *Yalkut* to *Wayera* (1360 answer to question 2).¹⁰⁴ As Baba Batra 10b charges, gentile philanthropy is self-seeking (1366, 1550). Gentiles perform meritorious acts for the sake of winning praise (1676). Or they design, by their philanthropy, to entice the unwary into theft, adultery and murder (1628). Not only is gentile *ẓedaḳah* sinful, sinful likewise is gentile *hesed* (something ordinarily higher and finer than *ẓedaḳah*), the Talmud thus construing *hesed le'umim haṭṭat* in Prov. 14.34b (1628). *ẓedaḳah* and *mišpat* characterise Israel who performs them in fulfilment of Divine statutes.¹⁰⁵ Israel only exhibits the benevolence which is disinterested (1550), compassionate (1342B, 1578), elevated (1628), kindly, and consecrated (1366). This is one of the several implications of Israel's name, the combination of *yašar* and *'El* (1342B). The only prompting of charity to be commended is that of the good heart (1488)—in biblical parlance, the circumcised heart (1342B). Such is the charity denominated *'abodah*, a term otherwise reserved for prayer and for sacrifice (1488).

Charity is to be actuated by the thought that, the poor being one of our people, shall not be despicable in our eyes (1596). One God created us (1523). We are brethern and should share the Father's gifts. Between children of the same parents, what barriers can there be? Again, the mere sight of poverty can be a charitable incentive (652). It can spur a person to give a hundred *manot* where otherwise he would give only one. As happened in Ber. 28a, when Rabban Gamaliel visited the home of R. Joshua, one must see the poor in their homes in order to realize what poverty means (1503). That spectacle will cause one's benevolence to persist. One of the many implications of *yašar* and *'El*, the components of *Yisra'el*, is that the true Jew pities the poor

¹⁰⁴ On the passage from the *Yalkut*, supra note 13. The passage is again quoted in 1710. Elsewhere Job is a paragon of benevolence (397, 683, 1713). See XI, p. 523 and p. 545, note 84. In 1360, first answers to questions 2, 3, 4, the objection to Job is that he delayed with his benevolences until he had amassed wealth. *Supra* p. 641.

¹⁰⁵ See XI, p. 543 on the superiority of conformity to spontaneity (555, 1214, 1416).

because he imagines how he himself would feel in that situation (1342B); like Joseph who went without food in order not to lose the awareness of what they suffered who had no food (1523).

Again, be it remembered that the Jews need the Jews. From gentiles, the Jews may expect no aid. The eight biblical synonyms for "poor" in Lev. r. 34, 6 suggest, among other things, the eight days of circumcision (1341). This reminds us that Jews depend for assistance upon their own. The non-Jews are uncircumcised of heart as well as of flesh. Maimonides cautions in *Matnot 'Aniyim* X, 2, that Jews need seek no help of the gentiles, because these are Israel's haters and persecutors (1314).¹⁰⁶ A woman obtains subsistence from none but her husband. Similarly the Jewish poor should have to go for subsistence to none but their own people (1314). Gentiles will not aid because the obligation to aid rests not on them but on us; just as strangers will dismiss a woman empty-handed who has a husband to look after her support.

Another prompting to charity can be the thought of the help which one receives from others¹⁰⁷ who have plowed, furrowed, sown, harvested and stored that one might have sustenance (580).

One's relations to the Supernatural can also be an inducement. We have pondered the doctrine which imputes poverty to the *Mal'kut*, one of the Cabalistic hypostases (1312, 1475).¹⁰⁸ The thought that the human poor belong to the same category can impel one to succor them.

Again, as we have learnt,¹⁰⁹ the poor are God's favorites (1202). It follows that one must honor the poor to honor God, while one must honor God to affirm God's existence. There is also the motive of enabling God to carry out His intentions (1314), God having made the poor and the rich expressly that the rich might extend aid.

To this we must add the consideration that we came into the world in order to cease living off of someone else

¹⁰⁶ Contrary is the sentiment in Tos. Giṭ. V (III), Edit. Zuckermann p. 328; Yer. Demai, IV, 3; Yer. Giṭ. V, 9; Yer. 'Abod. Zar. I, 3.

¹⁰⁷ Compare Matthew 10.8.

¹⁰⁸ *Supra* p. 661.

¹⁰⁹ *Supra* pp. 655 ff.

(1545).¹¹⁰ We continue thus parasitic when, without reciprocation, we accept God's gifts (1545). It is shameful for us to receive God's bounties without making some return but, as Prov. 19.17 teaches, the way to make such return is that of assistance to the poor.

God, of course, expects us to help the poor, His intimates (1529). This, we have often noticed, is the only manner in which we can render God any benefit. A man refuses to support or to ransom his wife if she declines to turn over to him her earnings. Similarly does God await our cooperation while we receive from Him support and ransom (1529). Compared with God's gift to us, our gifts to the poor are paltry indeed (580). Since one's self belongs to God and should be surrendered to God, how much the more incumbent it is to surrender one's possessions (228).

Gratitude to God can also be a factor, just as gratitude for the spoil taken from Egypt was Divinely expected to prompt generosity toward the manumitted slave (894).

At the very pinnacle of motivation stand the righteous. "The righteous, and all the more the saintly, perform noble deeds not for the sake of reward. They rejoice in the occasion to perform such deeds. They yearn that God might deem them worthy of the opportunity to fulfill His bidding. The very performance of His bidding is the only reward they wish" (1328). The mention of the navel in Cant. 7.3 expresses the thought that the righteous distribute to the poor that which they receive from on High, just as the navel of the foetus distributes throughout the foetus the nutriment obtained from the mother (1618). David was an example of such (1322): likewise Abba Taḥna in Eccl. i. 9, 4 (1328). The very act of giving is, for the generous, enlargement and exultation (1291).

BENEVOLENCE IS A DUTY

From all this it follows that—reward or no reward—one should ferret out an opportunity to perform an act of *Zedaḳah*, whatsoever one undertakes (1570). This is one of the numerous implica-

¹¹⁰ The phrase: (1140.9, 1548) מִן דְּלֹא דִילִיָּא בְּהִיל לְאַסְתָּכּוּלִי בְּאַפִּיָּה occurs again and again in the *Me'il Zedaḳah*. The extreme frequency of certain quotations is to be exhibited in a later installment of this study.

tions of *holek Zedaqot*, "walking in *Zedaqot*" of Isa. 33.15. The poor are, so to speak, dead.¹¹¹ Let the rich, functioning as God's partners, help the poor (719) and revive the dead (1541).

The duty of feeding the poor is implied by a complicated *gimatria* concealed in the words of Psalm 37.3 (1174). Such is also the upshoot of the verb-doubling through the infinitive absolute in Deut. 15.8 and 10 (1697). These doublings admonish that the indigent should receive not merely one's agricultural tithes but a portion of one's profits, whatever their source.¹¹² One of the many intimations to be gleaned from emending Prov. 22.28a to *gebul 'olim* is that one should not, by defaulting in charity, hasten the death of the poor and their consequent ascent into the hereafter (1515). While Deut. 15.7 bids "Thou shalt not close thy hand," it must be considered that one may refrain from giving though literally one holds the hand open (1513). The sense is that one should open one's hand and then close it, grasping some object which one then bestows upon the necessitous.

We should supply the poor with clothing and with delicacies as a man supplies his wife—as the masculine sun radiates light to the feminine moon (1314). Worthy of imitation is the rooster which, in the barnyard, shares with the other fowl whatever he finds (377). Be it remembered that true sumptuousness consists not in luxurious living but in bounteous giving (1670). One should cultivate the habit of giving and of giving eagerly (551).

How important then always to have cash on hand for purposes of charity as one does for purposes of business (680)! One should acquire an occupation, even a lowly one (608), which will enable one to perform *Zadaqah* and to practice *gemilut hasadim* (589, 622). Yes, one should, if necessary, sell one's self into slavery as was done by Elijah¹¹³ and by the wife of Joseph, the gardener (568).¹¹⁴ While justice is to be rendered with deliberation, no inhibition should attend helpfulness (369). Though, as a rule, we commend thrift;¹¹⁵ in benevolence, prodigality alone is right (1137).

¹¹¹ See XI, p. 519.

¹¹² See XI, p. 506, note 13.

¹¹³ See XI, pp. 538 and p. 561.

¹¹⁴ See XI, p. 531 and p. 561.

¹¹⁵ On the thrift of the righteous, XI, p. 561.

And one of the many deductions from the fact that '*ani* and '*ayin* are composed of the same letters is the thought that one must love the poor as the apple of one's eye (1407). The poor should not be despised (1596) or disdained (1699). For, who knows? They may be Divinely sent beings suddenly appearing, like the strangers entertained by Abraham, like the angel Gabriel who, in the guise of a newcomer, presented himself to Joseph (1699).¹¹⁶ Indeed, the ragged, shabby, blotched, and dirty beggar is not to be scorned (1537). Shrink not from him. Through him, one ascends a lofty eminence. It is like finding, steeped in mud, a gem through which one becomes wealthy as a king. Does one, for fear of soiling one's hands, cast away something which brings one to riches and celebrity?

In Lev. 25.35, the phrase, "live with thee," means feeding and clothing the poor that he will feel satisfied to stay where he is and not be driven by shame to seek abode elsewhere, among people whose clothes also are rags, whose hats are stubble, whose food dry bread, whose drink foul water and whose utensils are filth vessels, but among whom, for that very reason, one's poverty feels less poignant (1597).

Inasmuch as tarrying at table for discussions of the Torah is conducive to helping the poor,¹¹⁷ a table without such discussion is vile (1271). This is one of the reasons why gluttony in a boy constitutes punishable recalcitrance.

Moreover, one should not, depriving the poor, bequeath one's wealth to others (844). Let God take care of those others. Considering the rapidity with which fortune changes, what assurance has one that one will retain one's wealth long enough to bequeath it (1387)? As a weasel drags objects across the ground and knows not for whom it drags, so man toils without knowing for whom. Sometimes a man leaves his wealth to his wife's next husband (1198).¹¹⁸ Who can claim any assurance that his substance will get from threshing floor to house (1387)?¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ On Elijah in disguise, XI, p. 534 note 61 and p. 538.

¹¹⁷ See XI, p. 542 on paragraph 538.

¹¹⁸ See XI, p. 553.

¹¹⁹ On the other hand, the reflection occurs that leaving one's wealth to heirs who will use it worthily is the happy equivalent of taking it along (844).

We have already surveyed the reasons why, when it comes to benevolence, financial stringency and high taxes do not justify curtailment.¹²⁰ To reduce one's contributions at such times is like chopping off one's finger which has accidentally poked out one's eye (1443).¹²¹ One gets two defects where at first there was one. It is the old error of quenching fire with straw and thirst with salt water. A person is like a king's paymaster who is entitled to set aside a part of the funds for his own maintenance. The paymaster commits some wrong and suffers a fifty per cent decrease of his allowance. How foolish of him to stop paying the troops! By so doing, he incurs the penalty of death. God is King. He consigns treasures to the wealthy for transmission to the poor. Because of some sin, a person's wealth shrinks. To diminish one's benevolences is only to aggravate the trouble. Rather should one increase one's benevolences.¹²²

Giving is to be done even when giving is hard (1488). In Isa. 32.17, "the work of righteousness" refers to the wealthy with whom giving is an easy matter; but "the effect (*'abodat*) of righteousness" alludes to those in straightened circumstances for whom giving is arduous (1488). We are to be charitable in adversity as well as in prosperity (1591). In Psalm 41.2 which reads "Happy is he who considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in the day of evil," the phrase, "in the day of evil," modifies not "deliver" but "considereth" (910). Despite his worries, he considers the needy. That very phrase (Ḥag. 5a) about "lending to the poor in the time of his stringency" alludes, as we have seen,¹²³ to the lender's stringency (1732). It cannot refer to the borrower's stringency because, for the poor, all times are times of stringency (1488). Analogous is Deut. 15.8, where "that which he wanteth" means not the recipient's want but the giver's want (1663). The greatest charity is that which one extends when one is financially pressed (1732).

The truly benevolent person is he who, in order to aid the

¹²⁰ See XI, p. 529.

¹²¹ This paragraph is erroneously numbered 1446.

¹²² Divergent is the idea that, just as the number of judges varies with the size of the population, one should give according to one's means and one's circumstances (1282). See XI, note 51.

¹²³ See XI, p. 529.

poor, endures personal sacrifice. "He giveth of *his* bread to the poor" in Prov. 22.9 signifies the foregoing of adequate food for one's self (1625) and "He of the bountiful eye" is the one who contributes though he possesses only a loaf (1546, 1635). That he might command the means for allowing benevolent loans, a good man is severe, as regards household expenses, with the members of his own family (1588). Psalm 112.5 asserts this when it speaks of "sustaining his cause in judgement." "Judgement" means sternness, severity.¹²⁴

There are times when benevolence should be practiced even at the risk of one's life (844). One's safety ceases to be vital not only on one's death bed but also when no one else is at hand financially able to stave off disasters menacing large numbers. The frog in the *Perek Širah* substantiated its claim that its songs surpassed those of King David (1432). Why? Because the frog exemplifies self-effacement. The frog feeds its enemy with its own body. At least it does not hide itself or attempt to escape. The maxim, "Thy life taketh precedence" (Baba Meṣia 62a), refers not to circumstances of an ordinary kind (1635). Its application is limited to the wilderness where other food is unobtainable; just as the phrase, "He goeth to Gehenna who eateth what he getteth from his fellow man," alludes to cases in which that fellow man has only enough or less than enough for himself." The maxim is also non-applicable to scholars (1450, 1454). He who is not a scholar should die to save a scholar. The average layman, in his ignorance of the Torah, commits derelictions that render him worthy of hell (1450). By yielding his life, he shortens his period of wrong doing. Perishing in behalf of a scholar, he absorbs into himself all the merits of that scholar's learning. He enters the hereafter with the deserts of that scholar. The man, in the story,¹²⁵ who gave away his last morsel to the starving wanderer probably acted on this principle (47, 594, 1172, 1454). He may have judged from the miracle of the stranger's survival, that the famished stranger was a man of erudition.¹²⁶ The formula

¹²⁴ The contrary idea *infra* note 127 on paragraph 1247.

¹²⁵ See XI, p. 535.

¹²⁶ The underlying supposition is, apparently, that the miracle of survival proved the stranger to be a *Talmid Ḥakam*.

about the precedence of one's own life is also adjourned when there is an option between granting a free loan to a Jew or a loan at interest to a gentile (1434). The former course shall be preferred.¹²⁷

¹²⁷ Considerable divergent teaching also appears. The doctrine of Bab. Mez. 62a, "Thy life taketh precedence," occurs frequently without qualification (844, 1259, 1434, 1450, 1472, 1500). One is exempt from *Zedaqah* if one lacks food enough for one's self (1252.46, 47).

The question is raised whether the man who escaped being stung to death by an adder, after giving all of his food to a needy wayfarer (47, 1172 and XI, p. 535 note 64) had considered the maxim, "Thy life taketh precedence" (1454). The *Me'il Zedaqah* attempts to show that, even in this case, the maxim was heeded. Perhaps the man had hoped, despite his companions' warning, that he might nonetheless be helped either by his companions or by some casual passers-by, such as R. Hiyyah and R. José, mentioned as eye witnesses of the incident (47, 594, 1172). Or perhaps he knew that he was doomed and hoped that his act of benevolence might be rewarded with his rescue (1454). Or perhaps, he hoped to reach some human settlement before it was too late.

Similarly, on the principle of "Thy life taketh precedence," one gives clothes provided one has some clothing left for one's self (1500). It is true, the maxim applies only in the wilderness where fresh supplies are unobtainable (1635). But, if a person is penniless and, at the same time, too proud to beg, is not his position essentially that of someone straying in the wilderness?

Domestic peace is also a factor. A good man may, with philanthropic ends in view, be severe toward the members of his family (1588). Still, "If, for the sake of ampler allowances to the poor, one reduces the family's food allowance, the home may become a scene of strife" (1247). A remark of Maimonides to the contrary was possible because Maimonides could avoid the quandary, being a man of means.

There is also the decree of Usha, limiting to one-fifth of one's possessions, the amount which one might give away except by bequest (169). When Pe'ah I, 1 lists the "magnanimities unmeasured," it specifies kindness—not money (1206). The limit of a money gift is laid down in Ket. 50a as one-fifth. Mar Ukba, in Ket. 67b, gave more only by way of bequest. Maimonides, in his commentary on Pe'ah I, 1, holds that giving more than one-fifth is an act of especial saintliness. Maimonides may have meant a gift during one's life-time; still he used the word *latet*, "giving." He did not say *yebazbez*, "lavishing," which is the word in the Ketubot passages. Maimonides did not mean the lavishing of all or even of one half of one's possessions (1206).

A person should not give away so much that he will die of hunger or become dependent and need the benevolence of others (844); just as a vow is annulled if impoverishment will result from keeping it (522). Deut. 15.4a and Isa. 58.7b contain words construable to mean that one must look out

To be sure, the benevolent are not and need not be haunted by misgivings about the morrow (149, 551). On the benevolent, as we have so often reflected, the Lord will shower abundance.¹²⁸ In this faith, one should grant to the poor one's last *Peruṭah* (1682). The story of the man who gave his last morsel to the wanderer (47, 594, 1172, 1454) can illustrate how one might sooner trust in God than in the maxim, "Thine own life taketh precedence" (1454).

With reference to the distinction in Isa. 51.1, 7 between the "knowers of *zedek*" and the "pursuers of *zedek*," the superior ones, that is, the knowers are those who retain benevolence in their hearts even when, because of opposition, they may not practice benevolence openly (1524).¹²⁹ Such people will perform *Ṭedaḳah* as soon as the opposition abates (1602). However, one should not fear the reproach of men (1524). God created the frog which feeds her enemies with her own body¹³⁰ in order that man might be taught the practice of kindness even at the cost of calumny and humiliation (1432). Neither should the dread of committing some error in the course of a kind act deter one from attempting the act (1667). We have already stated that one's inability to give adequately should not impede one (1351). Every little counts.¹³¹ A *Peruṭah* may complete the two *Peruṭot* needed to purchase that minimum of bread which will save a person from starving.

There are times when, for the sake of benevolence, one might even suspend one's occupation with the Torah (643).

or one's own flesh first—that is, for one's self first and avoid becoming needy (1561). Indeed, the fine phrase in Ber. 17a, "provided one's heart be directed heavenward," might well apply to someone who, fearing destitution, markedly reduces his gratuities (1403). His heart is directed heavenward in the sense that he seeks, by curtailing his benevolences, to safeguard himself against the poverty which might drive him to blaspheme against Heaven. The righteous in fact, are of thrifty habits (659, 1125 and XI, p. 561 and *supra* note 115).

¹²⁸ See XI, p. 529.

¹²⁹ Though he might have done so, our author does not cite the case of the Sodomite maiden. See XI, p. 551 and p. 560.

¹³⁰ *Supra* p. 680.

¹³¹ *Supra* p. 654.

THE MANNER OF GIVING

Giving shall be generous. According to Šab. 31a, the first of the seven questions to be asked at the Judgement Seat will be: Hast thou dealt honestly, i. e. with 'emunah (1467)? But 'emunah means ZedaḲah. The proof is: 'emunah enters into the *first* of the questions asked on Judgement Day, while the first tractate of the Mishnah is the tractate "Seeds." Now, ZedaḲah is connected with seeds—note the phrase in Hos. 10.12, "Sow unto yourself with ZedaḲah!" This proves that ZedaḲah and 'emunah are the same.

But 'emunah means abundance, as shown by its use in Isa. 11.5. Hence, ZedaḲah is something which is to be accorded freely (1467). That giving should be ample and generous is also conveyed by the verb-doubling of "open thy hand" through the infinitive absolute in Deut. 15.8 (1302). If the recipient is a person of genteel tastes, one should, imitating Mar Uḳba in Ket. 67b, double the allowance. At least, toward the 'ebyonim, the class of the extremely poor, is generosity imperative, as the word *pizzar* in Psalm 112.9 indicates (1548).¹³²

In the last chapter of Abot de R. Nathan, there is reference to the great merit of granting to the poor one half of one's excess (*meḥezah mimotar*) (1701). Another recension reads "a half and over" (*lemeḥezah ulemotar*). According to the first recension, if one expects to earn fifty units and then earns one hundred, one assigns to the poor, twenty-five units, which is one half of the excess fifty. According to the second recension, the excess beyond one's expectation is the entire fifty. Should the total earnings amount to a hundred and five units, the gift would be fifty-five units. As the juxtaposition of the word "little" and the word ZedaḲah in Prov. 16.8 shows, whatever one gives is little compared with what one ought to give (1710).

If, putting one's hand in one's purse, one brings forth a gold coin, that is the coin which should be allotted (1615). The grasping of that coin was Divinely pre-ordained.

¹³² *Supra* p. 658, the lowest stratum is that of the 'ani (1468), and *supra* note 52.

The word *demai* for grain of uncertain tithing contains the initial letters of the words in Deut. 15.8 for "sufficient for his need" (1615); while Cant. 7.3 proffers the thought that every poor person should be helped to the extent of his needs, just as every mixture receives the water it needs, be it little or be it much (1618). A wealthy person should by all means grant sufficient to meet the applicant's wants (1214).

The wise man will multiply deeds of benevolence and of kindness in accordance with the blessings he has received (1591). When a poor person would bashfully ask one *Dinar* for his household Job, knowing the full extent of the want, would bestow five (1713). He "increased benevolence"—to use the phrase in Abot II, 8—in the sense of giving more than the poor person asked. It was the very failure of Nicodemus ben Gorion to give generously enough that his daughter intimated to be the cause of her poverty (1744). That story illustrates how surely impoverishment will overtake those rich people whose contributions are disgracefully meager (1666). This failure of the well-to-do to give adequately is stressed by the two-fold use of the word *ḥayyem* in that passage from the *Yalkuṭ* to *Wayera* (1360 answer 10).¹³³

One should generously aid even those by whom one has been treated unkindly (378). Just as Joseph sustained good and evil alike (1591) and as David was benevolent to virtuous and to sinful alike (1322), we likewise should be gracious both to the unworthy and to the worthy (1591). Who knows which is which? There are times when even an act of murder is not wicked—witness Moses' killing of the Egyptian (1322). Inasmuch as Moses was the reincarnation of Abel while the Egyptian reincarnated Cain, that slaying was entirely justified.¹³⁴ Let us be considerate even of those whose poverty and obscurity are the punishment of their stinginess in prior days of plenty (1715).

¹³³ On the location of the passage, *supra* note 13. Elsewhere, however, the *Me'il Zedakah* contrives to extract from Deut. 15.10, the sense that any gift is meritorious, no matter how wealthy the giver or how small the amount (1332).

¹³⁴ See XI, p. 537 on paragraph 872. In paragraph 534, Cain was reincarnated in Saul.

Do not spew those people out like some unpalatable article of food. They are already being chastised sufficiently. Those who practice benevolence when prosperous will, when they lose their possessions,¹³⁵ accept alms with composure, viewing those alms as the return of a loan. On the other hand, those who have, in better days, shirked benevolence will expiate sufficiently when, they recall what they enjoyed when times were brighter. Why afflict them any further? With people of scant merits, God Himself deals graciously (1290).¹³⁶ An example was Adam who performed not a single *mizwah*.¹³⁷ By no means should we attach any disqualification to an able bodied person's failure to work for a living (1693).¹³⁸ Perhaps an evil star fetters him to poverty, notwithstanding his efforts at self support.

And benevolence is to be performed constantly. One's benevolence must persist if one's possessions are to persist (1503); and our benevolence will persist if, like Rabban Gamaliel in Ber. 28a, visiting R. Joshua, we behold the poor in their homes and perceive the depths of their wretchedness. When an applicant is menaced by starvation, one should continue giving, though one has reached the limit prescribed at Usha (1326).¹³⁹ The fact that one has given already or that one's wife has given does not justify refusal to give again (563). If you have once clothed a poor person, inquire whether the clothes supplied are still wearable (1500). Perhaps he needs new clothes (1500).

That giving is to occur repeatedly is indicated by the fact that *wenatenu* reads the same both forward and backward (1236) and that *Zedaḳah* has the same numerical value as the *atbash* of *Zedaḳah* (83). This is further taught by the verb-doubling in the infinitive absolute for the "opening" of the hand in Deut. 15.8 (1239), as well as by the similar doubling in Deut. 15.10, of the

¹³⁵ How can the benevolent become poor if benevolence is the great prophylaxis against becoming poor? See XI, p. 529; also p. 549, note 86.

¹³⁶ On kindness to the undeserving, XI, p. 566.

¹³⁷ Did he not practice *pīryah weribyah*?

¹³⁸ This is one of the several instances in which the passage from Lev. r. 34, 4 and 7 is quoted: "What shanks, what loins, what a paunch, what avoirdupois, why not work?" XI p. 565 and *supra* pp. 653, 666 and *infra* p. 691.

¹³⁹ *Supra* note 127.

verb "give" (551, 1236), and also by the repetition of the word *zedek* in Deut. 16.20 (902). That a righteous person's *Zedakah* is *Zedekah* of the recurrent type is one of the significations of the phrase, "His *Zedakah* standeth forever" in Psalm 112.9 (1503); while the salient characteristic of a "gift, a loan, a partnership, a job making the needy person independent"—the highest of the Maimonidean eight degrees of benevolence—consists in its representing not an isolated, unrepeatable act but a continuing support (1360 answer 9). Otherwise, a person assisting once, might thereafter let the poor starve.

God's own benevolence with the manna teaches that *Zedakah* must be renewed every day and not restricted to casual intervals (1296). Just as the Torah begins with kindness and ends with kindness (Soṭ. 14a), so must benevolence not cease at the day's beginning (1290). It should recur, in the course of the day, even a hundred times (1591). That number, one hundred, is derived by adding the numerical values of the initial *nun* and the terminal *nun* of the infinitive, *naton* in Deut. 15.10 (1191, 1215, 1534). It is also derived from the unique sacredness of the letter *ṣ* (1534).¹⁴⁰ *Zedakah* is *zedah* "provision," plus *ṣ* a hundred (1215).

On the same day, one should be ready to give again and again, even to the same person (1557).¹⁴¹ Whoever performs charity in the morning does well to repeat it in the evening (172, 1236, 1302, 1737). One knows not which *miṣwah* will redound to one's greater advantage (172). When the *Derek Ḥayyim* says that evening time is not *Zedakah* time, it does not mean that, should the poor approach us in the evening, we may refuse aid (1479). The passage alludes merely to the dropping of coins in the box. In the evening, the contents of the box are not apportioned.¹⁴²

Among the numerous implications of the uniquely sacred letter *ṣ* is not merely the thought that one should give a hundred

¹⁴⁰ But in paragraph 1451 (*supra* p. 663), the sinister one-legged *ṣ* is contrasted with the auspicious two-legged *ṣ*.

¹⁴¹ This paragraph is erroneously numbered 1556.

¹⁴² According to 1257, it is especially meritorious to help the poor at the end of the day when the prospects of obtaining alms are dim. God does His helping at the end of the day (603 and XI, p. 516).

times a day, but also that one should give even after one reaches a hundred years of age and one's face become like that of *kof*, an ape (1534). *Zedaḳah* may no longer be needed then as a life extender. Nonetheless, one's benevolences should continue and should persist until death (1534). One should resort to *Zedaḳah* as one resorts to a healing potion. Properly does Roš Hašanah 6a identify *Zedaḳah* with "thy mouth" in Deut. 23.24 (509). *Zedaḳah* is associated with the mouth because it is something which is never to "depart from thy mouth."

One's donations should also be made with promptness (1592). As soon as one realizes a profit in a business deal, one should allot one's tithe.

Similarly important is it to perform one's benevolences joyously (1541). An act of charity is not to be a burden or something afterward regretted (1292). If performed gladly, a double compensation crowns the act (1541). Not only is the giving rewarded. The thrusting of the hand in the bag to reach the gift is also rewarded. We have perceived already how the giver's satisfaction shields the recipient from the untoward consequences implied in Prov. 15.27 (1602).¹⁴³ Charity accorded with a willing heart is 'abodah—that term otherwise reserved for sacrifices and for prayer (1488).¹⁴⁴

Finally the obligation to give rests on everyone (1207). Among the reasons why Lev. 23.22, dealing with *pe'ah* and *leḳeṭ*, stands between the two sets of verses treating the sacred days is that of imposing the duty of charitableness upon all categories of people—male and female, priest, Levite and layman (1433). All are obligated to honor God by that testimonial that God owns everything. Charity may be accepted even from an apostate (1214). Since the purpose of charity is to preserve the poor person's life, what difference does it make whether the donor be saint or sinner (1561)?¹⁴⁵ That is also the reason why

¹⁴³ *Supra* p. 648.

¹⁴⁴ *Supra* p. 674.

¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, it is maintained that the hospitality of the evil eyed should be rejected (1630). It should be repudiated even when the study of the Torah is at stake. The Torah came through Moses, the kindly eyed. Its way is the way of the kindly eye. It will not thrive under the evil eye.

a woman's saying to a man who offers her a loaf, "Give the loaf to the poor!" fails to constitute marriage (1207). Philanthropic obligations shall be evaded by no one. Even the recipient of charity should practice charity (758, 1536).¹⁴⁶

This, of course, does not gainsay that there are certain types of benevolence for which some people are not prepared (1503). For instance, the *Zedakah* of rearing children, requires that one be married and the writing of books for lending depends upon one's being endowed with a writer's skill.

As benevolence should not be reduced in hard times,¹⁴⁷ it should not be deferred until the hard times pass (369). Psalm 41.2 means: Happy is he who, even amid his own difficulties, considers the poor and does not put off aiding them until conditions improve (910). Nor is it short of foolhardy to delay until one is beset by trouble. Why wait until the hour of sickness (1707)? For the grievously ill, an elaborate procedure is recommended, involving complicated *gimatrias* and the shuffling of various coins (1466). Some of this money is presented to necessitous students. But were it not wiser to practice charity while in health and to retain one's health and to avoid the need of these involved therapeutics? Charity which is gold when one is safe and sound becomes silver if performed under the shadow of impending danger and, if postponed until one's last illness, amounts only to brass (1646). The time to open one's hands in benevolence is now (1551). One should not hesitate until, as the Midrash to Eccl. 5.4, says, one's hands lie open in death. After one's demise, there will be no opportunity for benevolence

Whoso accepts the hospitality of the evil eyed risks a diminution of the good allotted to him at the beginning of the year. It is also asserted that whoso solicits from a miser is punier than a miser (383). Seeking a gift from a miser is like seeking a fish in the desert.

¹⁴⁶ Nonetheless, the solicitor who obtains a gift from one who can not afford it (1325) exemplifies the case of one who is righteous but sinneth at the same time (Eccl. 7, 20). To press a poor person for a contribution or even to accept one from him is robbery (758). Orphans are exempt from contributing, except for the purpose of ransoming captives and even then, they are solicited only if the community is unable to raise the sum without asking the orphans to contribute (1369).

¹⁴⁷ *Supra* p. 679.

(452, 1152.25), except perhaps in the sense that the synagogues and schools which one has founded during one's lifetime will continue to function after one's life is over (1152.34).

Again, the admonition to pay the tithe as promptly as God sends the profit refers not only to agricultural produce but to income of all kinds, be it that of seafarers, of cameleers or of merchants (1592). Subject to tithes are even the illicit earnings of loans on interest (1697). But it is easier to tithe small amounts daily than to put off until the end of the year and tithe a heavy accumulation. When the total is large, the evil inclination is likely to inveigle one into tampering with one's allotment (1594). A little at a time feels less burdensome.

It is true, one does not violate the command against delay (Ex. 22.28) if one lacks confidence in the treasurer to whom the sum has to be paid (1576B). This applies, however, only when the poor still have some food (1578). It does not apply when food is exhausted and procrastination spells death.

Foolish in the extreme is the holding back of one's benevolences until the Messiah arrives (1152.26). In that happy time, there will be no poverty (1720) and no need of loans or of any kind of benevolence (1152.26). The time for one's charity is now.

EDUCATING FOR BENEVOLENCE

Charity has to be cultivated. Toward this end, we may avail ourselves of a number of expedients. One of them is meditation. In the calendar proposed in the book, *Me'il Šemu'el*¹⁴⁸ for such as would cultivate holiness, the day of the week allocated to meditation on *Zedaqaḥ* is Thursday (1560). The efficacy of Thursday, in this regard, is due to the fact that, on the fifth day of creation, the birds and the fish were produced and these are creatures which, instead of living by their own efforts, depend upon the compassion of God.

It further promotes one's charitableness if one reflects that what one gives consists not of one's own money but of God's

¹⁴⁸ By Samuel David Ottolenghi, Venice 1705. Steinschneider, *Catalog. Bodl.* No. 2473.

money (1292). One should also consider that God is the Father of all and that children of one Father help one another (1523). One should try to bring home to one's mind the poor people's sufferings (1523). The mere sight of poverty can spur one to overcome the evil inclination and to proffer relief (652).¹⁴⁹ Like Joseph who forewent food so as not to lose the awareness of what those endured who lacked food, one can suffer in the sufferings of others (1523). A fast day is preeminently the time for taking to heart what hunger means and feeling impelled to dispense food, grain and alms (1523).

Again, one may acquire the attitude of benevolence from the relationships within one's family (1661).¹⁵⁰ Even when reluctant to give to others, one gladly gives to one's wife (1661). One should also ponder the rotation of fortune's wheel (1523).¹⁵¹ Landing in poverty is a possibility for anyone. The very thought of acting uncharitably is an evil which one should flee (1211).

Since willingness as to charity is a matter of habit (551, 1521), three distinct acts of benevolence are requisite to dispel evil-hearted *unwillingness* (1521).¹⁵² The first act is likely to be accidental, the second deliberate and the third spontaneous. By the third giving, the evil inclination will have lost its vigor (1521). The adage about inciting the good over the bad will have been complied with. One who aspires to the uninhibited practice of philanthropy should therefore give thrice and giving will become natural (1619). One should bestow the available sum on three different poor persons—Psalm 112 proves it—and then giving will get to be a fixed trait. A somewhat kindred corrective for the interference of the evil spirit is first to give through a friend or a relative (1262). As a next step, one dispenses small amounts personally and then gradually increases the amounts. One may also train one's self by giving a little daily (1699).

¹⁴⁹ *Supra* p. 674.

¹⁵⁰ See XI, p. 539. From kindness to orphans, one learns kindness to everyone (846, 909).

¹⁵¹ See XI, p. 520.

¹⁵² See XI, p. 543 on the man who rehearsed benevolence by throwing bread to the fishes (192).

Happy is he who continues giving until giving becomes matter of course (1577)¹⁵³ and agreeable (551, 902). As intimidated by the words *holek Zedaqoi* in Isa. 33.15, in the way which one elects, one comes at length to proceed automatically (1570, 1693).¹⁵⁴

Defying the Tempter, one should therefore vanquish one's penurious tendencies (1661). No amount of importuning by a solicitor will achieve this (1521). A person must counteract his own selfishness by his own exertions. A *Peruṭah* given, with self-compulsion, avails more than a sumptuous gift without self-compulsion, because he who wrestles with his evil inclination subjects himself to distress (1536) and Heaven, seeing his ardor for sanctity, responds with its aid (1521). Subduing one's stinginess expresses the faith that God will replenish and a defiance of Satan who seeks to obstruct philanthropy through his emphasis on losses (1467). In fact, Satan is appointed to do this that man might display and develop his powers of resistance (1300). An analogy would be the harlot who was hired to tempt the prince that the prince's powers of withstanding her might be brought to light. A person who is so close-fisted that he declines to grant alms even on a fast day should frequently submit to the experience of going hungry and should wear sackcloth next to his skin (1523). The study of the Torah also counteracts that unholiness, especially when the Evil One whispers that the poor are unworthy and that, if aided, they will go forth and commit something wicked (185).¹⁵⁵ Blessed is he who, while not spontaneously generous and while frugal in his personal expenditures, nonetheless disciplines himself and succors the indigent, in obedience to God's command (1557).¹⁵⁶

Another factor here is one's associations. If one associates with the wicked, stinginess will become a part of one's nature (1693). One absorbs the manner of those reprov'd in Lev. r. 34.4, 7, who reply to the applicant for aid: "What shanks, what loins, what a paunch, what avoirdupois, why not work?" (1693). Similarly, the notion that there is no one who needs any alms

¹⁵³ Wrongly numbered 1556.

¹⁵⁴ Or rather, perhaps, by superhuman control.

¹⁵⁵ Misnumbered 178.

¹⁵⁶ Misnumbered 1556.

will sprout in those who consort too much with the wealthy (735). Perhaps this is among the reasons for avoiding skinflints and misers (375, 383, 384). Also to be eschewed is the companionship of those debauchees who are always fabricating excuses for declining to assist and who fancy that there exists no such thing as want in the world (735). Hobnobbing with such worthies, one becomes infected with their venom. In any event, one should turn a deaf ear to the lying arguments which seek to prove that *Ẓedaḳah* is superfluous and undesirable (1442).

Corollary to all of this is the merit of inducing charitableness in others. One should endeavor to convert a person from uncharitableness sooner than from any other failing (1269).¹⁵⁷ In this connection, the *Me'il Ẓedaḳah* considers the *pros* and the *cons* of commenting on benevolent actions with laudation (1555). Lauding elicits imitation. It stimulates people to compete with one another in enlarging their pledges. As Lev. r. 34.9 and 10 observes with regard to Reuben and to Boaz, how much greater would their generous deeds have been had they anticipated their scriptural publicity! Moses was praised in Deut. 34.10–12, that Israel might be led to emulate him. The lauded person is himself encouraged to continue and to augment his bounties. Monobaz and others were publicized for their donations to the Temple.

It may be objected that praise for a deed in this world diminishes the reward in the next (1555). That was why, when plaudits were conferred upon him, Phinehas ben Jair lamented. It may further be argued that praising a person excites deprecation; when they hear a person extolled, faultfinders begin to wag their tongues.

But, to these objections, there are replies (1555). One rejoinder is furnished in Pe'ah I. 1, which declares that, even when the dividends on a good deed are collected in the form of rewards here on earth, the principal still abides for collection in the Beyond. As for the deprecation, let it not be forgotten that, against the derogations of the wicked, the righteous are Divinely fortified. One might argue to the contrary that praise tends to

¹⁵⁷ See XI, p. 549.

confine the evil tongue's prevalence. To disparage a person whom one has previously commended is not easy.¹⁵⁸

And one should boldly denounce the uncharitable (1565). Occasions do arise, of course, when flattering the miserly is advisable (1738). Calling selfish people generous often terminates their tirades against the poor. But, on the whole, the traducers of the poor should be rebuked, though they be rich and powerful (1565). Against this progeny of the sly and deadly serpent, God, the Helper of the poor, will surely come to the rebuker's aid. While Jews may, for a time, heed the perverted logic, they will soon alter their opinions and side with those by whom the poor are defended. We should bear in mind that not only are the poor in the majority but that, in addition, they have the sympathies of the middle class and even of some of the wealthy; among the wealthy, upright and benevolent people do appear sometimes. The antagonists of the poor are distinctly in the minority. Why then need one fear that serpent's brood, those heretics, those God-insulters! The diabolical *kelippah* collapses at the first show of opposition. Such miscreance will vanish like smoke. The ex-

¹⁵⁸ The stimulation of benevolence is, however, not the only reason why the publishing of the good deed is recommended (1555). Other reasons are:

a. One result of the good deed will be that the children of the virtuous person will all the more readily obtain succor should they, in the future, fall into the need for such.

b. The knowledge of the deed will cause the doer's name to be used in prayer, pleading that the community be spared afflictions. The good deed in question makes the total of the community's virtues outweigh the total of its sins. Should the worthy deed go unpraised, the knowledge of it will fail to spread.

c. The public awareness of the deed can result in the mention of the deed in prayers for the repose of the doer's soul.

d. The knowledge of the deed will promote obedience to the command that the merits of the worthy deceased be commemorated by saying with Prov. 10.7, "The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing."

e. Praise further demonstrates the high esteem in which such *mizvot* are held by Israel and this deprives the Adversary of the charge that, in this respect, Israel is deficient.

f. It is unfitting that beholders should be unappreciative of a good deed. Such unappreciativeness would amount to rank ingratitude; for the good deed wins a Divine outpouring upon the entire world.

coriator of that ungodly crew will obtain rewards both here and hereafter.

There is also the person who, on his death bed, though mentally sound, devises a will aiming to avert contention among his heirs yet neglecting the charity which might avert contention between his soul and the powers sinister (1382). Bystanders urge the dying man to bequeath something to philanthropy; but he remains silent. He ignores the suggestion. One should refuse to attend such a man's funeral. Why honor the corpse of one who fails to honor his own soul?

Just as the evil person deters others from giving,¹⁵⁹ the generous person imbues others with his own magnanimity (1738). How high he ranks is well stated in Abot V. 16 (229, 707). As Baba Batra 9a avers, he who persuades others to contribute possesses merits exceeding those of the contributor himself (1325, 1651); and for him who converts another from uncharitableness, a two-fold requital is in store (1269). The effort of urging others to give is Divinely rewarded, even if the urging is unsuccessful (1436). In the rule allowing a sandal peddler to wear, dangling from his belt on the Sabbath, the straps from which his stock hangs on week-days, there inheres a symbol of these thoughts (1651).

This is also among the reasons why one should give even though one's gift is inadequate (1332).¹⁶⁰ One's giving will cause others to follow suit and thus the needy person's wants will be alleviated. When Rab Bibi, instead of handing each of his disciples a piece of fruit at his Sabbath treat, allowed them to help themselves, he provided a valuable object lesson in benevolence (498). His liberality was calculated to inspire the students with a similar liberality.

Therein also lies the superiority of benevolence in the form of a loan (1518). The borrower may, through the loan, be enabled to acquire wealth and to become himself a donor. Again, one of the reasons for the *pe'ah* is that something located in the corner of a field is too conspicuous to be overlooked and passers-by,

¹⁵⁹ *Supra* p. 644, answer to "argument" three; also p. 668. On the converting of the uncharitable XI, p. 549.

¹⁶⁰ *Supra* p. 654.

inclined to neglect their *pe'ah*, are wholesomely influenced (1433). Example rouses. Even ostentation does not cancel the Divine reward when the purpose of the ostentation is that of generating benevolence in others (1676).

It goes without saying that, along these lines, one should accustom the members of one's family (9). The worthiest bequest a man can leave his children is that of the reverence which leads to acts of philanthropy and particularly to the subventioning of scholarship (1387); while one of the many particulars in which a righteous person is a *holek Zedaqot* (Isa. 33.15) is that of habituating people to benevolence until benevolence, as it were, walks of its own accord. (1570).

Consonant with this is the high ranking of the charity solicitor (27, 29, 65, 1315, 1319, 1325, 1651). Charity solicitors stand higher, in some particulars than teachers (1315). It is their solicitation that subsidizes the teachers. Solicitors, moreover, prevail upon sinners to render the charity that expiates (1315). The result is that there is created in the world that preponderance of righteousness which is the *sine qua non* of the world's continuance (1315). Justly are the solicitors likened to the super-sun in which the upright shall bask. A person doomed to die not only because of some iniquity but also because of ignorance of the Torah and Mishnah should read a sacred page or two (1319). If unable to do so, let him become an administrator of charity and he will be saved. He will be forgiven all that rendered him liable to death even before that particular sin was committed.¹⁶¹

There is such a thing as begrudging others the merit of benevolence and the preserving of their property, by that "salt of money." From baseness like that, the charity solicitor is antipodally removed (707). It might be argued that, in declining

¹⁶¹ Other reflections pertaining to solicitors do not relate merely to their inducing benevolence in others. As the sun receives light from above and imparts some of it to the moon, the collectors retain for themselves the light of the *miqzawah*, after they have imparted to the poor the sums which they have collected (1315). Again, it is better to be a solicitor of charity than a disburser, because the solicitor can be held in check by the protests of those from whom he solicits, while the disburser is never certain whether the applicant for alms is someone dying of hunger or is only an imposter (1325).

to give, one might be actuated by the holy purpose of keeping one's possessions small (1411). One might choose to renounce wealth by renouncing the deeds of benevolence that are rewarded with wealth; and one might design the same for others. Wherefore Abot V. 16 affirms, "He who will not give and does not wish others to give is a wicked man." Any favorable inference is out of the question as regards that type of person.

Of course, merely prevailing upon others to give is not enough (1625). Let no one suppose that, inasmuch as Israel is one soul,¹⁶² a Jew acquires the merits which he persuades another Jew to acquire. One must be a giver one's self.

(This study is to be continued in a later installment.)

¹⁶² See XI, p. 554, note 91 and *supra* p. 667.

SUPPLEMENT TO "SOME REVOLUTIONARY PURIMS,"
HUCA X (1935), PP. 451-482

CECIL ROTH, London, England

Rome (1793)

THE Italian wars began in 1792, when the Holy Roman Emperor declared war against France and the Austrian possessions in Lombardy became a seat of hostilities. Sardinia entered the conflict, and was stripped of the provinces of Nice and Savoy: Tuscany recognised the revolutionary government, and accepted a French envoy. The Pope, Pius VI, refused to follow this example, his action being treated as an intimation of hostility. At this stage there arrived in Rome Joseph Hugh de Basville, Secretary of the French Embassy at Naples, on an official mission to take charge of French affairs. He was suspected of carrying on revolutionary activity: he was known to have the intention of replacing the royal arms on the various French public edifices with those of the Republic: and on Sunday, January 13th, he was seen driving through the streets, with his whole party openly flaunting the Republican cockades. This was too much for the reactionary Roman rabble to bear. They set upon the unfortunate Frenchman, and wounded him mortally. Thence they went on to the French Academy, which they sacked. The rumour spread that the Jews were in secret agreement with the French, and that a store of tricolour cockades had been discovered in the shop of a Jewish merchant. The Ghetto was accordingly the next objective. As the mob reached the Collegio Romano, according to report, they met two long-bearded friars. "Where are you off to, children?" the latter enquired. "To set fire to the Ghetto," they were told. "No, children," the friars replied. "Do not do this; it is a sin, and, if the Pope considers them innocent, it is not for you to adjudge them guilty. Poor folk! they are our brethren, and our neighbours; do not commit such a sin."

This intervention postponed the danger for the moment. But the next evening, disorders again broke out. Jews found in the

city were beaten. A great mob surrounded the Ghetto, and made a regular assault on it. Only the efforts of troops sent by the authorities prevented it from being rushed and sacked. But, around one of the principal gates, the Portone della Regola, boughs were piled high, and fire applied. The flames crackled ominously, and the assailants prepared to make a final attack when they had done their work. But, at the critical moment, the windows of the heavens opened, and the rain began to pour down, putting out the fire and affording the kind-hearted Marchese Accoramboni the opportunity to make a speech pointing out that God himself, like His Holiness, was clearly protecting the Jews.

The immediate peril was thus allayed. But, for eight days longer, the Jews remained cooped up in their Ghetto, afraid to venture out. The unrest was only abated when the authorities promised to restore to vigour all the old anti-Jewish regulations, which had fallen to some extent into desuetude in the course of the past few years — in particular the obligation to wear the Jewish Badge, the closing of all shops outside the Ghetto, and the prohibition to leave its walls after the sounding of the Ave Maria. Even now, some arguments still centred around the exact colour of the Badge of Shame, which were settled only after the Viceregent had made his choice between half a dozen samples, of varying shades of yellow, submitted to him by the *massari*. On February 17th, the Holy Inquisition put into force again the inhuman *Editto sopra gli Ebrei* of April 5th, 1775. Immediately after, all the Ghetto windows which communicated with the outside were walled up. The expense, of course, had to be borne (contrary to precedent) by the community: and, when objections were encountered, several of the principal members were arrested, on the day before Passover Eve, to enforce payment. Even before this, the community had been forced to write around to all the sister congregations of Italy to implore monetary assistance in its crisis.

This episode, known hitherto in only its barest outlines,¹ has

¹ Vogelstein-Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, II, 347; Natali, *Il Ghetto di Roma*, p. 155; Blustein, *Storia degli Ebrei in Roma*, pp. 200-1—the last, a particularly unfair account.

been illustrated recently by the discovery and publication of a vivid account, written apparently by Tranquillo del Monte, one of the leading members of Roman Jewry at the time.² This brings out, above all, the fact that the attack and the subsequent reaction were due to the unfriendliness of the mob: the authorities and the Papal officials not only being opposed to their action, but doing everything in their power to protect the unhappy victims. From these sources, it would appear that the time of crisis continued throughout the second half of January, 1793. But contemporaries considered that the essential danger disappeared with the providential downpour of the evening of Monday, January 15th. For the confraternity '*Ezrah Bazarot*' (possibly established at this time) chose the Hebrew date, Shevat 2nd, for an annual celebration "to thank the Blessed God for the miracle wherewith He saved all the Holy Congregation from the will of its enemies on this night." Two hymns were composed for the occasion by David Bondi, a member of a famous local family of scholars, and the Order of Service was published, apparently at Leghorn, in a slender eight-page brochure. A copy of this was acquired by the present writer in the course of a visit to Rome, while the paper to which these pages are a supplement was in the press.³

² "L'assedio del ghetto di Roma nel 1793 nelle memorie di un contemporaneo," by Enzo Sereni, in the *Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, 1935, X, 100-125.

³ ב"ה פזמונים שנוהגים לאומרים בני ק"ק של עזרה בצרות של ק"ק רומא יע"א בליל מוצאי ר"ח שבט בערבית ותקון שעושים להודות לאל יתברך על הנס שהציל את כל הק"ק מידי רצון קמיו בלילה הזה בשנת זכר עשה לנפלאותיו לפ"ק.

The poems begin respectively אור זה זמן נסים and אור זה זמן נסים. A verse of the poem deserves quotation:—

בורא אדון עולם.	וכל נברא.
הציל ומלט חיש.	לעם כלו.
מוך שחקים אז.	בעב קשר.
רוח ומי זרם.	ישועה לו.

בתי הכנסיות העתיקים באלכסנדריה וסביבותיה

מאת הרב יעקב משה טולידאנו, אלכסנדריה

הכל יודעים כבר את התפקיד שמלאו היהודים באלכסנדריה, לפני חרבן הבית השני ואחריו בימי היוונים והרומאים. בתוך אותו הישוב הגדול של היהודים האלכסנדרונים בתקופה המזהירה ההיא היה היו בחלקים השונים של העיר, וביחוד בחלק הדלתא על חוף הים, למן המקום „מאריטא“ כיום ועד לנמל העכשווי, בתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות רבים, שהיו נקראים פרוויכס, או סינגוגות, שבהם היה לחק בשבתות ובמועדים לקרות פרשת השבוע והחגים עם תרגום קריאת התורה, פרשת השבוע וענין היום בשפה היוונית המדוברת אז, כמו שיעידו על זה פילון ויוסיפוס בספריהם. אך מכל בתי כנסיות ומדרשות ההם אין אחנו כעת ידיעות על שרידיהם ועקבותיהם לא נודעו לנו, כמו שלא נשאר לנו כל שרידים מעקבות הישוב היהודי הגדול והמזהיר ההוא של יהודי אלכסנדריה. הרחוב „נביא דניאל“ שנמצא עוד בשם כזה באלכסנדריה, ושבו נמצאו הביהכנ"ס הגדול והרבנות הראשית כעת, אפשר מאד שמקורו מאותה התקופה¹.

מחברים אחדים טעו לחשוב את בית מקדש חוניו הידוע בתלמוד ובספרי ההיסטוריא של היהודים האלכסנדרונים, שבנה חוניו מבני בניו של שמעון הצדיק ברשיון תלמי פילומטר בשנת 404 לפני ספח"ג, שהיה באלכסנדריה, עיין ספר נועם המידות באות כ"ג ואבן ספיר ח"א דף י"ט ועוד. אכן זה לא נכון, כי מקדש חוניו היה באמת בעיר היליופוליס, היא און הכתובה בתורה. אלא שהיהודים האלכסנדרונים העריצו את המקדש ההוא וביאו את קרבנם אליו לה'. הקראי משה בשייצי שחי לפני 360 שנה כתב בספרו מטה האלקים כפי מה שהעתיק ממנו בספר דוד מרדכי פ"ט, מסורה אחת ששמע מזקן רבני אחד באלכסנדריה, ששמעון בן שטח, כשברח לאלכסנדריה, בנה בה בית כנסת גדול ויפה שבו היה גם מזבח להקריב עליו. אמנם נראה ברור, שגם זו היא שמועה מעורבת ממקדש חוניו עם בית הכנסת הגדול ליהודי אלכסנדריה שנדבר אודותיו להלן, ואת חוניו בן בנו של שמעון הצדיק החליף בשמעון בן שטח שכל כך שנאוהו הקראים תכלית שנאה. ואמנם כידוע חוץ ממקדש חוניו לא הקריבו יהודי אלכסנדריה קרבנות במקום אחר.

1 סמך לזה בסנהדרין צ"ו שאמר רבי יוחנן שדניאל נשלח להביא חזירים מאלכסנדריה של מצרים. ואמנם מבחינה היסטורית קשה להבין זה, היות שדניאל חי לפני אלכסנדר מוקדון מיסד העיר אלכסנדריה. ואם כי יש מהחוקרים בזמנו שרוצים לאחר את זמנו של דניאל לתקופה יותר מאוחרת, בלי ספק שרבי יוחנן לא היה דעתו כך. ואין לנו אלא לומר שכוונת רבי יוחנן היתה על המקום שבו נבנית אלכסנדריה אח"כ, שאולי היה שם ישוב קדום. בדרך כזה צריכים הננו לישב גם דברי ר"ס נאון שמתרגם את הפסוק בבראשית ומצרים ילד את לודים ואת ענמים וכ"ו אלתיסיין ואלאסנדריון, שכלי ספק שהכוונה על המקום שבו נבנית אלכסנדריה אח"כ.

לפי דברי הרמב"ם בפירוש המשנה מנחות פ"ג שהקופטים בארץ מצרים הם צאצאי כת בית חונוי. הכהנים והיהודים שנאספו מסביב למקדש חונוי היו אח"כ לכת מיוחדת ואח"כ קבלו עליהם את דת הנצרות. (ראה אבן ספיר ח"א בלוח התקונים שבסוף"ס עמוד א"). ולפי"ז נראה שמ"ש במגילה פ"א גיפטיט לגיפטים, שהם הקופטים, המכוון לפי זה על היהודים מבית חונוי, שדברו בשפה מיוחדת, אולי תערובת של יונית ועברית. סמך קצת לדברי הרמב"ם אלו יש, שביהכנ"ס העתיק של פסטאט מצרים שנמצאה בו הגניזה הידועה, ראינו שהוא היה זמן רב ביד הקופטים. ורק אח"כ בימי שלטון אחמד בן טולון (880 לספה"נ) עבר הוא וגם המגרשים של בתי כנסיות הקופטים באלכסנדריה לידי היהודים שקנו אותם מהם, כשהוצרך הפאטריארך הקופטי גיאקוביט מישאל לשלם מס עשרים אלף דינרים שהטיל עליו אחמד בן טולון, כפי שיספר מקריזי כרך 3 עמוד 248 (הוצאת קהירו 1926). מזה נראה שהקופטים הם עצמם צאצאי אותם היהודים יהודי בית חונוי, שבנו אותו. ואולם החקירות האחרונות ע"ד הקופטים במצרים מתנגדת לדעה זו של הרמב"ם לגמרי.

מהמסורת העתיקה שהביא משה בשייצי הקראי שזכרנו, יש להסיק דבר חשוב שביהכנ"ס הגדול שהיה ליהודי אלכסנדריה, הידוע בתלמוד סוכה נ"ו בתור סמל "כבוד ישראל", נבנה על ידי שמעון בן שטח. ואם נכונה המסורת הזו, להקדים כל כך את זמן בנינו של בית הכנסת ההוא, יותר יש ליחס את בנינו ליהושע בן פרחיה, או ליהודה בן טבאי, שישבו זמן יותר רב באלכסנדריה, כידוע. ועכ"פ הדבר שבית הכנסת ההוא נבנה על ידי יהודי ירושלים שבאו כידוע במספר רב באותה תקופה של ריב אחים, בני החשמונאים, לאלכסנדריה, ולא על ידי היהודים האלכסנדרונים עצמם, זה נראה נכון. ויש להוכיח זה מהספור שבא בתלמוד בבלי וירושלמי במסכת סוכה פרק ה". אמר רבי יהודה כל מי שלא ראה דיופלוסטון (בירושלמי הגירסא דיפלואיסטבה) של אלכסנדריה לא ראה כבוד ישראל מימיו אמרו כמין בסלקי גדולה היתה סטיו לפנים מסטיו. ופעמים היו בה כפלים כיוצאי מצרים ושבעים ואחת קתדראות של זהב היו שם, מקובעות באבנים טובות ומרגליות כנגד שבעים ואחד זקנים. וכל אחת ואחת היתה עומדת בכ"ה רבוא דינרי זהב. ובימה של עץ באמצע וחזן בית הכנסת עומד עליה. עמד אחד מהם לקרות בתורה, היה הממונה מניף בסודרים והם עונין אחריו אמן. אף על פי כן לא היו יושבים מעורבבים אלא כל בעלי אומנות בפני עצמם, זהבין בפ"ע, כספין בפ"ע, נפחין בפ"ע, טרסיים בפ"ע, גרדיין בפ"ע. שאם יבוא אכסנאי ידבק בבני אומנותו, ומשם היתה פרנסתו יוצאת הוא ואנשי ביתו. ומי החריבה טרגינוס הרשע. נולד לו בן בתשעה באב והיו ישראל מתעניין. מתה בתו בחנוכה והדליקו נרות. שלחה לו אשתו עד שאתה כובש את הברבריים בוא וכבוש את היהודים שמרדו בך. חשב מיתי בעשרה יומין בספינה אידלי זיקא ואייתי בחמשה יומין אשכחינהו עסקי באורייתא וקראו פסוק. ישא עליך גוי מרחוק (דברים כ"ח מ"ט) אמר להו מה אתון אמרין אמרי ליה הכי והכי. אמר להו ההוא גברא הוא. הקיפן בליגינות והרגו. באותה שעה נגדעה קרן ישראל, ועוד אינה עתידה לחזור למקומה עד שיבוא בן דוד. ע"כ.

והנה השם דיופלוסטון לפי דברי הערוך ורש"י וכל המפרשים הוא כמו דיו פלטין, זאת אומרת שני ארמונות כפולים סטיו לפניו מסטיו. אכן לפי"ז תהיה הסמך נוספת, וע"כ אני אומר שהמלה פלוסטון אינה מן פלטין כי אם מן פלסטין שהבית הכנסת ההוא נקרא על שם אנשי ארץ ישראל והקהל הפלסטיני שישבו באלכסנדריה והם שבנו אותו והתפללו בו. וכמו כן, ידוע לנו שבפסטאט מצרים היה בחקופת הגאונים בית הכנסת ירושלמי של אנשי ארץ ישראל, ולהיפך, מצאנו עוד שהיה ליהודי אלכסנדריה בית הכנסת בירושלים כנוכר בתוספתא ובירושלמי מגילה פ"ג ובמפעלות השליחים ז' ט'. ועוד, ברור הדבר שבית הכנסת הגדול ההוא שבאלכסנדריה היה בית הכנסת של יהודי ארץ ישראל, שהרי מהמסופר בנמ" הנ' שימים אחדים אחרי חנוכה, קראו שם בבית הכנסת ההוא את הפסוק ישא עליך גוי. ובאמת קשה הדבר שהלא פסוק זה הוא בפרשת כי תבוא שזמן קריאתה חל בסוף הקיץ, ואיך א"כ קראוהו אחרי החנוכה. מזה נראה, כי בבית הכנסת ההוא קראו הפרשיות כמנהג ארץ ישראל, הנוכר בפרק בני העיר במסכת מגילה, ושהתקיים עד ימי ר"ב מטודילא בבית הכנסת הירושלמי של פאסטאט, שהשלימו את קריאת התורה בשלש שנים וחצי. ובכך אפשר היה שיחול קריאת חלק מפרשת כי תבוא אחרי החנוכה. על הערה זו העיר ידידי הרה"ח דר" אברהם מרמורשטיין בהצופה כרך י"א צד 33. ולפי דברינו, שבית הכנסת עצמו היה בית כנסת ארצי-ישראלי, יבא על נכון. ובה הננו רואים כי אותה המסורת העתיקה שהוזכר ר"מ בשייצי, על בית הכנסת הגדול ההוא שנבנה ע"י יהודי ארץ ישראל, יהיה שמעון בן שטח או בן טבאי, נכונה וצודקת.

גם הנוסע ד"ר פרנקל בספרו משא מצרים צד 206 כותב, "היהודים באלכסנדריה מראים חורבה אחת קרובה לבית החולים מחמודייה ששם הוא שריד בית הכנסת רבי בן גוריון, הנוכר בתלמוד, שהיה גדול ומפואר מאד כבית המקדש בירושלם". ובלי ספק שהשם בן גוריון הוא טעות, ונתחלף זה בהמסורה שבית הכנסת ההוא נבנה על ידי יהודים מירושלם, ששם בן גוריון היה רגיל ביניהם בתקופה ההיא. לפי"ד ר"מ בשייצי והנוסע ר"י ספיר, מקומו של בית הכנסת ההוא היה בבית המסגר המוסלמי שע"י הנמל. ולפי הנוסע ד"ר פרנקל הנו', מקומו הוא בחורבה הקרובה לבית החולים מחמודייה. ואמנם הנוסע החוקר אליעזר הלוי ד"ר ליווי, מזכירו של השר מונטופיורי ז"ל, במכתב מסעו משנת תקצ"ח (1883) כותב, ראיתי את המקום אשר לפי דברי התושבים עמדו עליו ביהכ"נס של אלכסנדריה המהוללה, ושם המקום ההוא, "אל תיל" אשר ממנו ילכו אל תעלת אינדיא ובו היתה אבן אשר עליה חרותה כתובת ישנה מאד. אך אחרי אשר אין אתם יודע איה האבן גם לא ידעו להגיד את הדברים אשר היו כתובים עליה, על כן אחשוב כי בית הכנסת היה במקום אחר, אצל העמוד אבליסק המפורסם בשם הכוב מחטת קליאופאטרה, ושם כר נרחב. ונדע לכל כי במקום ההוא עמד בית הכנסת בימי קדם וגם עתה הקיפו אותה ויחלו לבנות בית הכנסת, אשר לא נשלמה עוד, ומביא שלש ראיות שם על זה. האחת קרבת המקום אל מרכז מכובד, כזה של האבעלליסקין, וליהודים אז היתה השפעה גדולה ליקח להם מקום כה נכבד. שנית,

בית הקברות הקדמוני הסמוך לו, והשלישית, כל המקום הזה חלול מתחתיו ורק היהודים שהיו אז בעלי יכולת עשו את זאת.

בשנת 1902 נמצא מחוץ לעיר, רחוק 25 ק"מ, כתובת יוונית כזו על אבן שיש: לכבוד תלמי המלך ובירניקי המלכה אחותו ואשתו ובניהם נוסד בית הכנסת הזה. האבן מונחה במזרח גריגורמאין.

מעתה נעבור מהאין אל היש. מתקופת העבר, שאיננה כבר, אל התקופה האחרונה, אל בתי הכנסיות שהן קיימות עד הנה. עוד מתקופת הגאונים נמצא כבר זכר לשתי בתי כנסיות באלכסנדריה, שאחת מהנה חידש את בנינה השר הנדיב נתנאל בן אליעזר מגדולי יהודי אלכסנדריה בש" 1028 כפי שזכר במכתב רבי יהושע הכהן בר יוסף הדיין של הפלישתנים באלכסנדריה לרבי אפרים בר שמריה, שהדפיס קאוויילי מגניזת פסטאט מצרים. רבי בנימין מטודילא, שיזכיר שהיו בימיו שלשת אלפים יהודים באלכסנדריה, אינו כותב ע"ד בתי כנסיותיהם. ורק שנים אחדות אח"כ מוצאים אנו בתשובת הרמב"ם סי' כ"ט וסי' ט"ל (הוצאת מק"נ ירושלים תרצ"ד) שמזכיר שני בתי הכנסיות באלכסנדריה אחד קטן והשני גדול. כשלש מאות שנה אחרי כן נזכר גם השם בית הכנסת אליהו הנביא בהנוסע רבי משולם מוואלטירה שחי בשנת ה"א רמ"א, וכדאי להעתיק דבריו. הוא כותב: שיש באלכסנדריה כששים בעלי בתים יהודים ואין בהם שום קראי ולא שומרונים, כ"א רבנים, ומנהגם כמנהג הישמעאלים במלבוש, ואינם נושאים מנעלים, ויושבים על הארץ, ונכנסים בבית הכנסת בלי מנעלים, ובלי בתי שוקיים. ויש יהודים שזוכרים שבימיהם היו שם ארבעת אלפים בעלי בתים, ועתה נתמעטו. ויש להם שני בתי כנסיות האחד גדול, והאחד קטן. ומעידים כל היהודים כי הקטן בנה אליהו ז"ל ושם היה מתפלל. ויש בתוכו היכל ואצלו כסא ונר דולק תמיד בתוכו. ויש לבית הכנסת ההוא שני שמשים האחד רבי יוסף בר רבי ברוך והשני רבי חליפה, ונעשו מעצמם שמשים בבית הכנסת הנז'. וספרו לי בפיהם שבשנת רט"ו (1455) בליל צום כפור נשארו לישן בבית הכנסת הזה עם שנים אחרים. ויהי בחצי הלילה ראו כלם דמות אדם זקן חשוב יושב על הכסא. והסכימו ללכת לפניו בהכנעה והשתחויה ולשאל אותו איזה דבר. וכאשר התקרבו ונגשו אליו נשאו עיניהם ולא ראוהו עוד. ואיננו כי לקחו אלקים. וספרו לי כמה נפלאות שראו בבית כנסת זה. וראיתי בעיני ספר עשרים וארבע (תנ"ך) בקלף בארבע חתיכות כתיבה גסה אשר כמוה לא ראיתי ליופי, גם הס"ת שכתבה עזרא הסופר. וראיתי חתימתו, והוא הניחה לעזובן בבית הכנסת ההוא מאליהו הנביא ז"ל. וישם ברכה (קללה) על האיש אשר יוציאה מבית הכנסת. גם ראיתי ספרים אחרים בכתיבת יד בבית הכנסת ההוא. עד כאן.

שבעה שנים אחר כך היה רבי עובדיה מברטנורא שבמכתב מסעו אחרי שספר שבא מאברקיר (Abu-kir) רגלי דרך ח"י מילין עד לאלכסנדריה כותב: בערב שבת הולכים כלם יהודי אלכסנדריה לבית המרחץ ובשובם מביאות נשותיהם להם יין, ומרבים בשתיה ואחר כך מביאות התבשיל שהכינו לסעודת הערב ואוכלים מבעוד יום עד שתחשך ואחר ששתו ושכרו באים כלם לבית הכנסת במלבושיהם

היפים נקיים ומונהגים ומתחילים בשירות ושבתות ומארכים בתפילת ערבית עד שתי שעות מהלילה ובאים לביתם ומקדשין וכ". ואין מתפללין תפלת המנחה של ערב שבת בצבור בכל גלילות ההם. והם שומרים שבת כתקנה בגלילות אלו יותר ממה ששומרים אותה בגלילות אחרים כי לא יצא איש מפתח ביתו בשבת לא לטייל ולא לדבר אחר, אלא לדבר מצוה, או לבית הכנסת או לבית המדרש. ואין צריך לומר שאין גם אחד שידליק אש ביום השבת או נר שכבה, אף על ידי גוי ועבד ואמה. ומי שיודע לקרות קורא כל היום אחר שיפוג יינו בשינה. מספר הבעלי בתים היהודים היושבים היום באלכסנדריה כחמשה ועשרים ויש להם שני ביהכנ"ס קדמונים האחד גדול וחרב קצת והאחר קטן ממנו. ורוב הקהל מתפללים בקטן כי הוא מיוחס לאלהיו הנביא מפני שנגלה בו לחסידים שבהם בפנה אחת מפנותיו דרומי מזרחי ומדליקים בו נר תמיד. גם כעת מקרוב פחות מעשרים שנה אומרים שנגלה בו אליהו לזמן אחד וברוך היודע האמת וכלם יושבים על מחצלאות או על הטפטים. דוד הראובני בא בשנת רפ"ג לאלכסנדריה והתפלל בלילי ר"ה של שנת רפ"ד בבית הכנסת הקטן, "בית הכנסת אליהו" יחד עם בעל הבית שלו יצחק בוכבזי ורבי בנימין.

הקראי שמואל יעמשיל מקרים במסעו שנדפס בס' גזוזי ישראל מס"ט פט"ב, כתב שהיה באלכסנדריה בשנת ת"ב וראה שם שלשה בתי כנסת לרבנים ושלשים בתי תפלה לישמעאלים שאחד מהם בנוי על אלף עמודי שיש.

בשנת תקי"ג בקר באלכסנדריה הרב חיד"א וכתב אז במסעו מעגל טוב, שרחוק מהעיר מעט יש בית הכנסת נורא מאד ושם עשרים ושש עמודים של שיש וקורין לו ק"ק אליהו שמסורת בידם ששם נגלה.

הנה מכל הדברים האלה, יש להסיק את המסקנות: (א) שהשם בית הכנסת ל"אליהו" ניתן לבית כנסת זה, לפני כחמש מאות שנה בערך, כי בזמן הרמב"ם לא נודע עוד שם זה לביהכנ"ס זה. (ב) שהשם הזה הונח על סמך הספורים שאלהיו נגלה שם בפנה הדרומית מזרחית לזקנים ולשמש, ולא כמו שיאמר ר"מ מואלטירא שנבנה מזמן אליהו הנביא ושם התפלל. בלי ספק מסורה כזו אין לה יסוד. מסורות כאלו של בתי כנסיות מיוחסות לאלהיו, מזכרים גם על עיר ארם צובא (Aleppo) כפר גובר בדמשק, פסטאט מצרים, ועיר גווגר במצרים כפי שיספר ר"י סמברי בספרו, ובירושלים. אך למסורות אלה אין כל ערך היסטורי. וגם ביאת יהודים למצרים, מזכרה לראשונה רק עד ימי סנחריב, שכתוב היו היורדים מצרים לעזרה, כדברי רשב"י בסוכה נ"א, ולא מימי אליהו. (ג) שמלבד "בית הכנסת אליהו" היה בית כנסת אחר יותר גדול שנבנה מזמן קדום מאד, אולי בזמן אחד עם בית הכנסת אליהו. והוא בלי ספק בית הכנסת הידוע כעת באלכסנדריה בשם בית הכנסת אביואדיל. בהכתובת העתיקה שנמצאת ביסוד פתח בית הכנסת ותלויה בקיר המערבי של עזרת בית הכנסת כתוב: "אני יהודה ב"ר שאול ספרדי בן יצחק תנצב"ה, קניתי ובניתי . . . לכפרת נפשי ונפש אבותי בשנת אלף ושלש מאות ואחד עשר לחרבן. אלו העמודים והמשקוף היו בפתח ההיכל . . . של ב"ה הא" ויירא ויאמר מה נורא המקום הזה אין זה כי אם בית אלהים וזה שער השמים, ואת הפתח

והשער ה" עליהם לזכרון . . .". נראה מזה שעוד אז בשנת 1311 לחרבן, שהיא שנת ה"א קמ"א (1381), היה מכבר בית הכנסת הזה עומד על תלו. ור"י בן שאול הנזכר קנה המקום ותקן בו תקונים, ומצא את העמודים והמשקוף שהיו על פתח ההיכל הקדום. ולא כמו שחושב החכם טראנאן בספרו *Les Communautés Israelites d'Alexandrie*, p. 70, שר"י בן שאול בנאה מחדש ע"ש⁸⁸. ובלי ספק איפוא, שביית הכנסת, הגדול" שמזכיר הרמב"ם שהוא אחד משני בתי כנסיות שהיו בזמן הגאונים באלכסנדריה, הוא בית הכנסת הזה הידוע כיום בשם בית כנסת אביזראדיל, כאמור. ורק שהשם הזה, אביזראדיל" לא ידוע לנו מתי הותחל. אפשר מאד שר"י בן שאול הנזכר הוא עצמו התייחס למשפחה זו, ועל שמו נקרא כן, אם כי בהכתובת הנ"ל לא כתוב כי אם יהודה בן רבי שאול בן יצחק ספרדי, או אולי שנמכר בית הכנסת הזה אחר כך על ידי צאצאיו של ר"י בן שאול לאחד מבני משפחה זו, ועל שם הקונה האחרון נקרא בית הכנסת בשם זה. משפחה זו אביזראדיל מוצאים הננו בין חכמי מגורשי ספרד במארוקו ובארץ ישראל. ראה בספרי נר המערב פרק יוד ובתקנות רבני ירושלם משנת ר"ץ שנדפסו בס" חיים וחסד מר"ח מוסאפיה (ליורנו ת"ק). וכן נמצא מקרוב בכפר אחד בספרד מצבת אבן גדולה מהמאה הרביעית שחקוק עליה שם רב גדול עשיר ממשפחה זו. כפי שהדפיסה הרה"ה דר" ולצר בחוברת, גם בספר חבל בני יהודה פי" על הגדה ש"פ (ליורנו תקס"ט) דף כ"א. מזכיר שם רבי יוסף אביזראדיל שחי באלכסנדריא וממשפחה זו נמצא עד היום בין יהודי מצרים. ואולי ר' יוסף אביזראדיל הנזכר, היה הקונה האחרון של ביהכנ"ס זה. ומכיון שנתברר לנו ששני בתי הכנסיות, "אליהו" ו"אביזראדיל", קדומים בזמן כל כך עוד מימי תקופת הגאונים, הנה בלי ספק שנוכל להקדים את בנינם עד לתקופה הקדומה של תקופת היהודים האלכסנדרונים. כמו שר"מ מולטירא והכותב במורה ומערב תר"ף צד 538, ייחסו כן את זמן יסודו של בית הכנסת אליהו. ולדעתנו, שניהם בית כנסת אליהו ואביזראדיל נוסדו בזמן אחד בערך. ואני חושב שהסבה להמסורות המסתוריות שחופפו על בית הכנסת אליהו ביותר, הוא מפני היותו בריחוק מקום, מחוץ לעיר, ועי"ז היה בודד ועוזב ברוב הזמנים. ולא כן בית הכנסת אביזראדיל שהוא במרכז העיר וברחוב יהודי.

עוד בית כנסת שלישי עתיק נמצא ברחוב היהודים שנקרא בשם ביהכנ"ס "עוז". ואצל כותבי המסעות נזכר לראשונה על ידי הקראי שמואל יעמשלי משנת ת"ב כמו שזכרנו. אך לא בשם בית הכנסת, "עוז" כמו שהוא נקרא עכשיו. כי אם בסתם. ואמנם בשם בית הכנסת, "עוז" מצאנו שזכר בשו"ת דרכי נועם אה"ע סימן י"ו משנת תכ"מ. ששם כותב על דבר הריבות שהיו בין הנבון אפרים גרבוני ובין אלמנת הגבאי המפואר כה"ר יוסף חמץ נ"ע, על אודות המולך (אחוזת) של הבית שבבד בית הכנסת של החכם עוז וזה"ה שחציה של חמיו וכו'. מלשון זה נראה שהחכם עוז, בעל בית הכנסת שעל שמו נקרא, חי רק איזה עשרות שנים לפני שנת תכ"ט, ובאמת מצאנו שני חכמים מהמשפחה זו עוז שחיו במצרים לפני כן. האחד רבי חיים עוז נחמני. בשו"ת רבי בצלאל אשכנזי סי' כ"ו ובס' קורא הדורות ויניציא דף מ"א שכותב עליו שנסע אחר כך ממצרים לעיר ברוסא בתורקיא ושם מת. והשני, רבי

יצחק עזון, עשיר וידוע במלכות נזכר בשו"ת אהלי יעקב לר"י קאשטרו סי' ח"י. ולפי הנראה שבית המולך, שעליו ידובר בשו"ת דרכי נועם הנ"ז, שהיה בצד בית כנסת זה, הוא הבית שבו עכשיו התנור של הקהלה היהודית באלכסנדריה המיוחד לאפיית המצות בכל חג פסח. ולפי מה שהוגד לי מוקני הקהלה, היה בית הכנסת הזה רכוש הוואקף (הקדש) של המוסלמים, והיתה הקהלה משלמת סכום ידוע בשנה להוואקף המוסלמי. ורק לפני כשלושים שנה נתפשר הגבאי של בית הכנסת עם הוואקף וקנה מאתם את זכותם על המקום. נראה מזה שאחרי שהיה בית הכנסת הזה רכושם של היהודים החזיקו בו הוואקף המוסלמי בזמן מן הזמנים ולקחו אותו. ויהיו היהודים צריכים לחזור ולהתפלל בו בשכירות שנתיים ששילמו להוואקף המוסלמי. ולכן מכל זה אני חושב שבעל בית כנסת זה היה רבי חיים עזון נחמני הנזכר ברבי בצלאל ובס' קורא הדורות הנ"ל. וסיבת יציאתו ממצרים לתורקיה היה מפני הרדיפות שגרף על ידי המוסלמים שלקחו גם את בית הכנסת שלו מידו. ודבר זה רגיל היה במדינות המוסלמים להעליל על בתי יהודים, בפרט כשיש סמוך איזה מסגד ישמעאלי. כשתקנו את בית הכנסת זה מקרוב, נמצאה אבן שעליה כתוב פסוקים אחרים, ומצורת הכתב ניכר שנכתב במאה ה"ו, בימי הרב עזון מיסדה. ואם לא היה הבית הכנסת רכושו ואחוזתו, לא היה חוקק כתובת אבן שמה. לצערנו הכתובת היא לא שלימה ואפשר שהיה כתוב בחלק החסר שם הרב עזון וזמן הבנין.

עוד בית כנסת רביעי היה נמצא בשנת ה"א שמ"ט באלכסנדריה, בית הכנסת של רבי יעקב קאסטרו (מהריק"ש), כפי שנזכר בשו"ת שלו אהלי יעקב הנז' סי' צ"ב דף קמ"א ע"ב. אך לפי הנראה לא נתקיים בית הכנסת הזה זמן רב, יען כי מהריק"ש עבר למצרים ויהי לרב העיר שם. ואמנם כאילו נבואה היתה שעתיד להיות ביהכ"נ בשם כזה לאחד מיוצאי חלציו. הוא בית הכנסת קאסטרו אשר במחרם ביך, שנבנה בשנת 1920 מיסוד המנוח מוסה קאשטרו ז"ל על ידי בא כחו האדון אלפרד טילקי הי"ו.

עוד שלשה בתי כנסיות אפשר לחשוב בין בתי הכנסת העתיקים בעיר. האחד, מדרש רב ידידיה, של רבי ידידיה ישראל ז"ל, שהיה רב פה בין תקס"ב — תקפ"ז. ושהיה בית המדרש שלו מול בית הכנסת אביזראדיל לצפונה. ועכשיו איננו כבר. והשני הוא בית הכנסת של הבארון "מנשה" שנבנה בשנת תרל"ג. והוא נזכר במסעו של השר מונטיפיורי אז בעברו דרך אלכסנדריה, שראה בבנינו. והשלישי, בית הכנסת "גוהר" שנבנה בשנת 1884 על ידי אליהו גוהר המנוח. בבית כנסת זה נמצא ספר תורה שכתבו רבי נתן עמרם ז"ל רב העיר בעצמו בערך שנת התר"י, עם תיק יפה שעליו חקוקים שמות מלאכים ופסוקים שונים. בארבע בתי הכנסיות — ק"ק אליהו, אביזראדיל, עזון, ומנשה — נמצאים חלקים מספרי תנ"ך עתיקים הידועים לקהל פה בשם: "קדמונים" לפי דברי הנוסע ר"מ מולטירא הנז'. היו ארבע חתיכות של תנ"ך וס"ת מיוחס לעזרא הסופר בק"ק אליהו, אך עכשיו אין רק שתי חתיכות. זאת אומרת שני חלקים מן תנ"ך עתיק שהם נכתבו לא בזמן אחד, בערך ה"א ק'. אמנם הס"ת העתיק המיוחס לעזרא, שראה ר"מ מולטירא

בבית הכנסת אליהו, איננו נמצא עוד כלל. ולא ידוע איו. ואני חושב שאולי נתחלף לר"מ מולטירא בס"ת העתיק שהתיחס לעזרא, שהיה בביהכנ"ס פוסטאט מצרים שהזכירו גם הרמב"ם ונוסעים רבים.

מהתנ"ך הקדמונים שבארבע בתי הכנסיות ההם, היותר חשוב הוא התנ"ך השלם הנמצא בבית הכנסת אביזראדיל שבו גם המסורת הגדולה של בן אשר ובן נפתלי בכתב יד יפה ובציורים ושלובים נהדרים, בדף האחרון רשום שם דוד הכהן ידיע קוטינא בשנת ה"א קכ"א כנראה, כי לא מובן פרט השנה היטב. והוא הובא משאלוניק כפי שכתוב בשטר המקנה שבתחילתו הכתוב בשנת ה"א רפ"ג. בבית הכנסת, מנשה² נמצא רק חלק מן הנביאים שנכתב בפורטוגאל בעיר אשבונו (ליסבון) שנת ה"א ק"ט, וכנראה, איפוא, שהובא על ידי מגורשי פורטוגאל שבאו לאלכסנדריה. לחלקי התנ"ך הקדמונים האלה הנקראים סתם בפי ההמון בשם "קדמון" נותן הקהל האלכסנדרוני כבוד והערצה יותר מהס"ת עצמם, ובשמחת תורה בכל שנה מקיפים בהם את "ההקפות" וראש הקהל או הרב של הקהל לוקח בידו את "הקדמון" ומקיף, ואחריו נושאי הס"ת.

בבתי כנסיות האלה היו איזה מנהגים שנזכרו אצל קדמונו. ונזכיר קצתם. מנהג היה בזמן הרמב"ם באלכסנדריה שהביאו את המת בחצר בית הכנסת והמתו עד שיתפללו הצבור ואז יבואו הדיינים והחזנים ואחר כך כל הקהל עם המטה ויאמרו צדוק הדין וקניות כל אחד מהחזנים. ואז מוליכין אותו לקבורו. ועל זה נשאל הרמב"ם אם מותר, ואסר להם, להכניס המת לחצר בית הכנסת (תשובת הרמב"ם הוצאה הנ"ל סי' כ"ז).

כן היו נוהגים בתחילה להתפלל שחרית באיחור זמן. אך עוד לפני בוא הרמב"ם מצרימה בא רבי שמואל החסיד² לאלכסנדריה וקבע בשבתות וימים טובים תפלת ותיקין שהוא בהשכמה עם הנץ החמה. ונמשך מנהג זה בשתי בתי כנסיות הקטן והגדול. ואחרי גומרם התפלה רובם היו הולכים, ואחדים ישבו לשמוע דרשה או לקרוא דבר. וכשהיו באים אחרים שאיחרו בכדי להתפלל, היה החזן הראשון חוזר ומתפלל שליח צבור פעם שניה בשבילם. ועל זה ערערו אחדים מהקהל ופנו בשאלה להרמב"ם והשיב שאין להשגיח במיעוט שלא התפללו בהשכמה. (שם סי' כ"ט).

ביום הכפורים שאומרים קרוב² ובשבעות שאומרים היו אזהרות, היו מגדולי הקהל שסדרו בבית הכנסת הקטן הוא ק"ק אליהו, שיאמרו אותם אחרי העמידה והחזרה, למרות שאיזה מן הקהל התנגדו לזה. ורק בבית הכנסת הגדול עמד הש"ץ שם בכל תוקף נגד זה ורצה דוקה שיאמרו הקרוב² והאזהרות בתוך החזרה. ולכן הוצרכו ראשי הקהל לפנות להרמב"ם שיעזור להם בהוראתו. והוא השיב שעל אנשי בית הכנסת הגדול להיכנע לתקנת ראשי הקהל ולא להשאיר פירוד ומחלוקת ביניהם (שם סי' ט"ל). גם בדבר קריאת הס"ת בהי"ג מדות: י"י י"י אל רחום וחנן וכו', היה המנהג בשעה שהש"ץ הגיע להם בס"ת היה שותק עד שהצבור קראו אותם

² לפי דברי פריימאן בהערותיו שם ר"ש החסיד זה שבא לאלכסנדריה לפני בוא המיימוני למצרים הוא רבי שמואל בן חנניה הנגיד.

ג"כ, והרמב"ם השיב להם שאין לזה עיקר אבל הוא לא ימחה על העונים, ויניחם כפי מנהגם (שם סי' מ"ה).

המנהג היה גם כן שהכוהנים היו עומדים בנשאם כפיהם ע"י ההיכל, ואחוריהם כלפי ההיכל אף כשהוא פתוח. והיו איזה מקדמוניהם שמיחו על זה. והרמב"ם התיר להם, מכיון שהם"ת הם גבוהים מעל הארץ עשרה טפחים. לפי הנראה מזה רק באלכסנדריה היו ההיכלות גבוהים כל כך מעל הארץ, מפני הרטיבות שלא תקלקל את הס"ת.

כפי שזכרנו בשם הנוסע ר"מ מולטירא היו נכנסים הקהל יחפים בלי מנעלים לבית הכנסת, וישבו על מחצלאות או שטיחים. ורבי עובדיה מבארשטורא ספר עד כמה היו מכבדים את השבת, ושהיו עושים „טועמיה" כמנהג ערי המזרח לטעום מתבשיל השבת בע"ש. אלא שבאלכסנדריה הפריזו בזה יותר, שאחרי שהתרחצו כלם היו אוכלים ושותים לשכרה עד שהיו צריכים להתפלל מנחת ערב שבת בבית. ואת תפלת ערבית התפללו רק עד אחרי שתי שעות מתחלת הלילה. ואמנם המנהג הזה נתבטל אחר כך.

רבי יעקב פראגי רב באלכסנדריה במאה ה"ז יספר בשו"ת שלו סי' כ"ח אשת חיל אחת היה דרכה בכל יום ערב שבת ללכת לבית הכנסת לכבד ולהסיר העפרורית והאבק ולנער המחצלאות ולהציעם ולתקנם. ויהי היום אחרי שגמרה מעשיה שמעה צעקה בבית יהודי עשיר מהדרים בשכונת בית הכנסת ושמעה שהם מריבים עם המשרתת שלהם שאבדה בדרך השוק חפץ זהב אחד שנפל ממנה. ויהי בלכת האשה ההיא ותמצא החפץ ההוא ותקחהו. ותבוא האשה אל הרב הנ"ל לשאול אם תוכל לזכות בחפץ ההוא וליקחהו או חייבת להחזירו לבעליו. והרב הורה לה שמכיון שהחפץ נפל בדרך השוק במקום שהרוב גוים, בוודאי נתיאשו הבעלים ממנו, ומותר לה ליקחנו. מהספור הזה אנו רואים איך הנשים כבדו ונקו בעצמן את בית הכנסת חנם, לכבוד השבת. וכן נוכח מכאן שעוד עד המאה ה"ז ישבו בבית הכנסת על מחצלאות, ולא על ספסלים.

רבי יעקב פראגי הנזכר הנהיג בבית הכנסת באלכסנדריה לחנך את הנערים שיקראו בס"ת בצבור בדקדוק ובטעמים, כדי שיתגדלו להיות שלוחי צבור מומחים בני י"ד שנים (גנת ורדים אור"ח כלל ב' סי' כ"ג). ובזמנו היה הגבאי של בית הכנסת הרב סעדיה סלאמה (שו"ת מהר"י פראגי הנז' סי' ע"ט).

מנהג היה ג"כ שנבאי בית הכנסת פרעו בעד שליחי הצבור של ביהכ"נ את המסים שהיה עליהם לשלם לממשלה מידי שנה בשנה. ובשנת התקל"ח קרה ששר עריץ מושל העיר מרד בממשלה הטורקית ויטיל על הקהל לשלם את המס השנתי תיכף לפני הזמן. והגבאים שלמו אז כרגיל בעד השלוחי צבור של ביהכ"נ. אך אחרי שבועות אחדים נהרג המושל המורד על ידי שרי החייל שלו, והממשלה המרכזית שלחה לגבות המס עוד פעם. ואז טענו הגבאים שבהיות שכבר שלמו פעם אחת את המס של הש"ץ אין עליהם לשלם עוד פעם שנית והש"ץ אמרו שהמס הראשון היה שלא בצדק והגבאים צריכים לשלם המס הרגיל בפעם שנית. ואת טענותיהם הגישו לפני רבי אליהו ישראל הרב באלכסנדריה אז, והוא הצדיק את

טענות הש"ק, ויכריח את הגבאים לשלם את המס עבור הש"ק גם בפעם השנית, וקול אליהו שו"ת לר"א ישראל, ליוורנו תקס"ט, ח"ב חו"מ סי' ו'. בזמנו של רבי אליהו ישראל הנזכר היה כבר המנהג ג"כ שרב העיר ידרש שלש פעמים בשנה, שבת הגדול, שבת תשובה, ושבת כלה. פעם בביהכ"נ אביזראדיל, ופעם בביהכ"נ עזוז. ולפי הנראה שבק"ק אליהו לא היה קהל המתפללים רב, ולכן לא דרש שם. שם מוצאים אנו בדרשותיו של רבי אליהו ישראל הנ"ז שדרש בין שנות תקל"ג—תקמ"ד, יטיף למוסר פעמים רבות לקהל היהודים באלכסנדריה אז, שהיו רגילים ללכת לבקורים ולטיול לק"ק אליהו שמסביבה היו גנות ופרדסים. וישתו וישכרו שם אנשים ונשים ביחוד בחול המועד. וגם בתוך ימי השנה היו החולים הולכים שם אנשים נשים וטף ויושבים וישנים שבוע או שבועים להתרפא בזכות קדושת המקום. אך על ידי התאספותם שם היו באים לידי שחוק וקלות ראש ודברים מכוערים, ועל זה הוכח הוכיח פעם כפעם הרב הנזכר בדרשותיו אל הקהל. ובין דבריו הוא כותב שיש הסכמה מהרבנים הקדמונים בחרמות ונדרים שלא להתנהג שם בביהכ"נ אליהו בקלות ראש לשתות יין ושכר, לא בתוכה ולא בגנותיה, ואפילו סמוך לפתח הנעשה מחדש (שני אליהו ליוורנו תקס"ו דף כ"ח מ"ה ס"ג). הסכמה זו לא נודע מתי נעשתה. ועכ"פ מהדברים האלה נראה שהיה אז ביהכ"נ אליהו מיוחד לביקור חולים והשתטחות יותר מאשר למקום תפלה.

רבי אליהו ישראל בדרשותיו הנזכרים הטיף פעם כפעם להקהל על היחס שלהם לביהכ"נ שלא תמיד ידעו לנהוג בהם כבוד כראוי, והיו מדברים בתוך ביהכ"נ, ולפעמים באו להתפלל במלבוש הלילה. ביחוד אלה שהיו דרים בשכונת ביהכ"נ ובקרבתו, שתמיד חשבו את ביהכ"נ כבית דירה שלהם, או כאילו הם בקאפי שברחוב, המידאן" ושם הרחוב שבו דרו המון העם יהודים ושאינם יהודים ושני אליהו הנ"ל דף ל"ח.

במלחמת נפוליון בונפורטי בשנת 1790 הטיל על הקהלה מס כבד. וכשלא יכלה לשלם, ירה בתותחים על בית הכנסת אליהו הנ"ז ויהרוס אותו, ונשאר כך בהריסתו עד שנת 1836 שהמושל מוחמד עלי העיר את הרב הראשי אז רבי שלמה חזן ז"ל מחבר ספר המעלות לשלמה ועוד, על שמשאירים בית כנסת זה בחרבנו. וזה עורר את ראשי הקהל ובעזרתו של השר משה מונטיפיורי ז"ל, נבנה סוף סוף בשנת 1850 בצורתו הקדומה. ובשנת תרס"ד 1904 חודש בנינו עוד פעם בשכלול נהדר ורחב ובצורה מודרנית, נשען על עמודים גראניט. בקיר המזרחי של בית הכנסת תלוי לוח שיש. שעליו חקקו בזמן בנינו משנת תר"י (1850) את הדברים האלה:

מה טובו אהליך יעקב משכנותיך ישראל

מה נורא המקום הזה

זאת לזכרון על בית הכנסת הקדוש הנקרא

ק"ק אליהו הנביא ז"ל

אשר הוא קדוש ולא נודע לנו זמן בנינו רק מצאנו

בס' מסעות של רבי עובדיה מברטנורא ז"ל

ממסעו מאיטליא לעיה"ק ירושלים ת"ו בש' 5247
עבר על דרך אלכסנדריה יע"א וכה דברו שמצא בה בית
כנסת קטן ורוב הקהל מתפללים בו כי הוא מיוחס
לאלהו הנביא ז"ל.

ובשנת התק"ן 5550 אשר בא נפוליון פרימו נחרב בימיו
ובשנת התר"י 5610 השתדלו מעלת הגבאים המפוארים
ס' ראובן בוגנאח וס' יוסף חכים והמשתדל ס'
יוסף סאקיס נ"ע וכל הק"ק אנשי העיר היו בעזרם
בהשגחת עט"ר מע' הרב ר' שלמה חזן ז"ל ובנה אותו
ונמנה גבאי ס' יוסף חאכים והמשתדל ס' שלמה לניאדו נ"ע
ובשנת התר"מ נלב"ע הגבאי הנ"ז וקרוב שנה לפטירתו
נמנה לגבאי ס' אלעזר מירס נ"ע והמשתדל ס' שלמה בארדה
ה"ו יה"ר שתהא משכורתם שלימה באורך ימים ושנות חיים
עד בוא גואל ומשיח לישראל ונראה בנין בית תפארתנו יראו עינינו
ויגל לבנו במהרה בימינו אכ"ר. שנת צדיק כתמר יפרח לפ"ק.

וכמובן שהכותבים הנ"ל לא ידעו שעוד לפני רבי עובדיה מברטנורא נזכר
ביהכ"ס אליו זה גם אצל נוסעים שקדמוהו, וכי ביהכ"ס זה נקרא מקודם ביהכ"ס
„הקטנה“ אחד משני בתי כנסיות שהתקיימו באלכסנדריה בתקופת הגאונים, כמו
שהוכחנו.

גם ביהכ"ס „הגדול“ שנקרא אח"כ ביהכ"ס אביזראדיל הנ"ל כמו שכתבנו,
לא נשאר בתכניתו הישנה כי בשנת תרמ"א (1881) נתחדש בנינו ושוכלל.
מבתי הכנסיות אשר בהערים הקרובות לאלכסנדריה יש לציין את הערים
הנזכרות מטה.

דמנהור (Damanhur). — ר"ב מטודילא לא יזכיר את העיר הזאת, אך
הרמב"ם בתשובותיו (הוצאת מק"נ הנ"ל ס' קנ"ד וק"ו ועי' מאן ח"ב עמוד 317)
יזכיר את היהודים שבכפר דמנהור עם רבי חלפון דיין הקהלה. הביכ"ס העתיק
שהיה בה נחקים עד לפני עשרות שנים. אך כשסללו את מסלת הברזל במצרים
והממשלה בנתה תחנה שם בתוך העיר, נהרס הבית הכנסת הישן ובנה אחר ע"
המנוח משה סרוסי נ"ע, רחוק מן העיר קצת, סמוך לכנסיות הנוצרים ממש.

רשיד (Rosette). — מזכיר אותה ר"ב מטודילא בתור אחת הערים שהגילום
משתפך אל תוכה, אך לא מזכיר שהיתה בה איזה קהלה יהודית בזמנו. אמנם ר"מ
מואלטירא מזכיר את יהודי רשיד הנושאים מצנפת ייאלו (ויוליס תכלת) על ראשם.
גם מזכיר את ר' פארשיילא מרושיט. וכן הקראי שמואל ימשיל במסעו הזכיר
שני בתי כנסיות שראה ברשיד. ובכמה מתשובות הרדב"ז ובתשובות רבני אלכסנדריה
ומצרים כמו בס' דרכי נועם לר"מ הלוי וגנת ורדים מבנו (חז"מ כלל ה" ס"י מ'
ואה"ע כלל ס"י י"ג) ומטה יוסף לר"י הלוי מיר (ח"א יו"ד ס"י ג' ואה"ע ס"י ח')

ואזולאי בשם הגדולים ע' רבי דוד גרשון, מזכירים את קהלת היהודים ברשיד שהיתה פורחת אז במאה ה"ו ו"ז.

כדאי להזכיר כאן שבאוצר המלך המנוח פואד, מלך מצרים הקודם, נמצאות תעודות היסטוריות בלשון טורקית מפקודות ממלכתיות שקבלו מושלי מצרים מהשולטאן התורקי בימי שלטון תורקיה במצרים. וביניהם נמצאת תעודה אחת, שתוכנה, איך השולטאן התורקי במאה ה"ז קבל מרבים מסוחרי מצרים הערבים קובלנה נגד הסוחר יעקב היהודי ברשיד שהיה לו המונופול מהשולטאן על כל האימפריה של הסחורות הבאות מארץ הודו ותימן שהוא היה מקבל אותם ומחלק לסוחרים. וכשמת החזיק בנו במונופול זה. ורצו הסוחרים הערבים להתנגד לזה ולקחת זכות זו מידו. ועל זה שלח פקודה השולטאן התורקי למושל מצרים, שאם לא נמצא עון בבנו של יעקב בעל הזכות אין להם לקחת את המונופולין מידו, ועליו להשאירו על משמרתו זו שהיתה לאביו יעקב. תעודה זו הראה לי ידידי הרב הראשי בקהיר רבי חיים נחום שליט"א, שנמסרה לידו יחד עם תעודות האחרות מאת המלך הקודם בכדי לתרגם עבורו מטורקית לצרפתית. ואני חושב שהסוחר בעל המונופול יעקב זה הוא ר' יעקב ביזאש שמוזכרו רבי יוסף סמברי בספרו דברי יוסף בתור שר וגדול שנהרג בש" תט"ו ושחי ברשיד.

במאה ה"ח נתדלדלה קהלת רשיד, וכל תושביה כמעט עברו אח"כ לאלכסנדריה ועד היום ידועות משפחות רבות מיהודי אלכסנדריה שהם יוצאי ירך היהודים שהיו ברשיד. ור' יעקב ספיר כשנסע שם מצא רק שתי משפחות יהודיות עם בית כנסת ישן וחרב. וכעת אין אף משפחה יהודית אחת שם. והערביים תושבי העיר מראים על חרבה אחת, שריד בית כנסת יהודי.

ד מ י י א ט (Demiat). — והיא לפי דעת ר"ס גאון בתרגומו ור"ב מטודילא העיר כפתור שבתורה או קפוטקיא בלשון חכמים.⁸ בימי ר"ב מטודילא היו בה, כמו מאתים מישראל, גם דוד הראובני מזכיר את ר' מרדכי מדמייאט. וכן בתשובת הרב"ז ובספרי רבני מצרים ואלכסנדריה שזכרנו מעלה מזכירים הקהלה היהודית בדמייאט שאנשיה סחרו באקספורט ואמפורט לחוף הים.

וכפי שזכר בס' מטה יוסף או"ח סי' י"ב דף כ"ב ע"ג היו מספר בתי כנסיות או בדמייאט. מלבד בית כנסת פרטי שהקדיש, אחד המיוחד בדורו שהיה לו קרקעות בדמייאט ואח"כ הקדיש אותם לעניי ק"ק ספרדים בירושלים ת"ו.

גם בדמייאט התדלדל הישוב אז במאה ה"ח ורובם באו לאלכסנדריה וגם לקהיר. וגם בתי כנסיות שהיו שם ונחרבו, החזיקו בהם הערבים תושבי המקום. ומה כשלים שנה כאשר עסקו בבנין בית ערבי אחד, נמצאו מתחת למפולת ספרי תורה וספרי דפוס וכ". כנראה היתה זו איזה, "ישיבה" או גניזה. חלק מהספרים הובאו ע"י העדה האלכסנדרונית לאלכסנדריה וחלק מהם נתפור ונאבד.

⁸ וכ"כ הפרחי בכמה מקומות מספרו כפתור ופרח.

אל מחללה או אל מחללה אל כוברא (El-Mahalla ou El-Mahalla El-Koubra). העיר הזאת נזכרה בתשובת הרמב"ם הוצאה הנ"ל סי' קנ"ה ורס"ד, ור"ב מטורילא יזכיר שהיו בה חמש מאות יהודים. גם באוצר הקהלה בקהיר נמצאו שתי תעודות מהגניזה של פוסטאט שבהם רשימת אנשי אלמחללה שנדבו סכומים לפדיון שבויים שהובאו לאלכסנדריה פעם בימי רבי שמואל הגניד ופעם שנית בימי הרמב"ם. גם בכתבי ההיסטוריא הערבים מוזכרים את קהלת יהודי אלמחללה ואת בית הכנסת. הישוב היהודי בעיר זו מתקיים עד כה עם בית הכנסת ובית קברות עתיקים. ולפי הנראה שעתיקותו של בית כנסת זה עמדה לו שלא נחרס. וכמו שיספר ר"י סמברי צד 135 שבהרס הנורא שהיה בש' ה"א ס"א ליצירה החריבו הערבים בתי כנסיות יהודים ובתי תפלה נוצרים רבים ורק אלה שהיו בנין קדמון קודם לידת מחוקק הדת שלהם לא הרסו אותם. ר"י סמברי צד 119 יזכיר גם הוא את בית הכנסת שבעיר אלמחללה ושבה נמצא ס"ת אחד קדוש שהתיק שלו מנחשת קלל וחרות על התיק שמות הקדושים וצירופים של שם בן ע"ב ומומור אלהים יחננו בציור המגורה, והכתב הוא ממטה למעלה וכ"ו. ומנהגם שאין קורין בו אלא מראש חדש לראש חדש, ונשבעין עליו. גם ר"י ספיר בס' אבן ספיר ח"א דף כ"ב יספר על הבית הכנסת והס"ת הנזכרים ומסיים ח"ל: "ושאלתי מה יתרון לס"ת זה מכל ספרי תורות שבישראל ואין מגיד לי דברים ברורים, אבל קבלה בידם כי קדמון הוא מאד ואיש אלהים קדוש וטהור כתבו, והרבה נסים נעשו בו, רופא חולים ומתיר אסורים וכ"ו. ואולם ידעתי שהרה"ג החכם החוקר מו"ה משה חזן שהיה אב"ד באלכסנדריה בא לדרוש ולחקור על הס"ת זה ובדקו והגיהו ואמר להם שאסור לברך עליו כי נפסל מרוב ימים. ויהי כמצחק בעיניהם וחשבוהו לכופר. על כן לא הרביתי עוד לבדוקו, אך ראיתיו בהשקפה קטנה ברגש קדש ס"ת גדול על גויל באותיות אשורית ספרדית מכתב אדמים יפה מאד וכבר אמרו רז"ל הכל תלוי במזל ואפילו ס"ת שבהיכל".

ר"י ספיר לא הגיד כל מה ששייך לס"ת הנזכר. הס"ת זה ידוע שם בעיר אלמחללה בשם ס"ת של רבי חיים אלמשאטי. יען כי עליו נמצא כתובת כזו, ניתן במתנה מאת חיים בר חננאל בן אברהם אלמשאטי לביהכנ"ס הירושלמית. בכדי שהאל יברך אותו ואת אחיו שמואל ומנשה וכל בני ביתם" מזה נראה שהס"ת הזה היה מקודם בביהכנ"ס הירושלמי בפוסטאט, והובא אחרי זמן לעיר אלמחללה. מי הוא זה רבי חיים אלמשאטי? ידידי רבי חיים נחום הרב הראשי בקהיר מצא בהיסטוריינים הערבים מתקופת הפאטימים במצרים שמוכרים את השיך (הוקן) אבו אל פאכיר אל עטאר אבן אל אמשאטי, "חכם גדול ורופא מצוין שהיה חביב על כל הקהלות יען כי לא הבדיל בין דת לדת". ובתעודה אחת מהגניזה משנת 1162 נזכר רבי אלמשאטי מפוסטאט, ושליפ"ז אפשר לאחד את שניהם. וגם השבח ששיבחוהו סופרי הערבים שלא הבדיל בין דת לדת, ניכר שלא היה בן דתם. וכבר ידוע כי לרבים מחכמי היהודים אז היו שני שמות, אחד שנקרא בפי הערבים ואחד שנקרא בפי היהודים. ואם כן יתכן שבחרבן העיר פוסטאט בשנת 1168 (ראה מקריז"ב" עמוד 143) יצא השיך אבו אלפאכיר שהוא הרב אלמשאטי מפוסטאט

ולקח אתו הס"ת שלו שהיה מונח שם בבית הכנסת הירושלמיים והתיישב בעיר אל מחללא.

ומצאתי בשו"ת מהר"י בירב סוס"י נ"ה שראה בכתב יד ספר זמנים להרמב"ם כמו מגיד משנה והיה תלמיד מובהק מהרמב"ם שמו היה הרב רבי יעקב אמשאטי, והיה לומד הלכה מפיו וכ"ו. וניכר שיש ט"ס וצ"ל פירוש ספר זמנים וכ"ו. ואולי היה זה בנו של רבי חיים אלמאשטי. או אולי ט"ס וצ"ל חיים במקום יעקב. ויצא לנו שרבי חיים אלמאשטי או בנו בעל הס"ת העתיק שבעיר אל מחללא הנזכר הוא היה תלמיד מובהק של הרמב"ם ולמד תורה מפיו.

הביהכנ"ס והס"ת הנזכרים שבעיר מחללא הם נקדשים ונערצים עד כה בפי יהודי מצרים ואלכסנדריה. ובכל שנה בראש חדש אייר הולכים רבים לעיר אלמחללא לבקר שם ועושים הילולא וחג.

A NEW SUPPLEMENT TO THE "THESAURUS OF MEDIAEVAL HEBREW POETRY"

ISRAEL DAVIDSON, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York

WITH the publication of the first volume of *The Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry* (N. Y. 1924), I did not stop recording the new poems that were brought to light afterwards. Due to this, I was able to issue in 1933 a supplement to the Thesaurus comprising more than four thousand new poems; and now, four years after the publication of that supplement, I have a sufficient number of poems on record to justify the publication of a second supplement.

The reason for the rapid growth of new material is to be found first in the great activity of the members of the "Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry," established by Mr. S. Schocken and guided by the well known authority on Hebrew poetry, Dr. H. Brody. His contributions and the contributions of his able assistants: Dr. Schirmann, Dr. Zulay and Mr. Haberman during the last few years have been responsible to a great extent for much of the new material. Then there are also a few other scholars, engaged in this field of research, as for instance, Dr. S. Bernstein and Rabbi Joseph Marcus, both of New York, whose contributions helped to increase the list of new poems. To a lesser degree those who reviewed the Thesaurus also helped to augment the list by referring to books and articles that had escaped my attention. Thus, e. g. Mr. David S. Sassoon's review (*JQR.* N.S. XXI, pp. 89-150) was most helpful, as it gave a complete list of the poems of Samuel ha-Nagid's Divan and numerous other additions. Thanks to these various factors, I am able to give here 1287 poems unrecorded before and in addition supply printed sources for 177 poems which heretofore were known only through manuscript sources. These latter items are not numbered, but are followed by the numbers originally assigned to

them in the previous volumes of the Thesaurus. In order that they may easily be distinguished from the entirely new poems they are printed in smaller type.

As formerly so also now I have refrained from using lists of poems drawn up by others, but as I did make a few exceptions before, such as are indicated in the preface to the first volume of the Thesaurus (pp. xv-xvi), so I am also making one now in the case of the list of poems from a manuscript in the library of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem compiled by Dr. Schirrmann and published in *Kiryat Sepher* (vol. xii, pp. 515-523). In all other cases my information is based on personal examination. The fact that I wish to hold myself responsible for every statement has kept me from making use of second hand information. I prefer to be incomplete rather than risk being incorrect. That there exists such a risk I shall proceed to show from the inaccuracies of some of my reviewers.

Let it not be misunderstood for a moment that I am not grateful for the generous appreciation which the Thesaurus received at the hands of the reviewers. On the contrary, I am fully conscious of the debt of gratitude I owe them both for the sentiments expressed and for the information given; but the point I want to make is that one must not accept information blindly without personal examination and this can best be illustrated from the contributions of the reviewers.

Take for instance the supplementary information given by Mr. Abraham Yaari in *Kiryat Sepher* vol. xi, pp. 235-251. In that article Mr. Yaari lists 74 poems not recorded in the Thesaurus. On examining the list carefully and tracing the poems to their sources, I found that I could include in this supplement only 12 of them (Nos. 1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 26, 29, 30, 32, 56, 62). As to the rest, a great many of them are occasional poems, which I exclude from the Thesaurus on principle, some are of too late a date to be included, one (No. 20) is already found in the Thesaurus but has been overlooked by the reviewer, and one (No. 72) is no poem at all but a collection of biblical verses.

The four poems listed by him under Nos. 39, 43, 44, 45 were not included in the Thesaurus and are not given in this supplement either, because I regard the work of Rabbi Isaac Chajes

(פני יצחק Cracow 1591), from which they are cited, as one long poem with numerous acrostics, and I deem it quite sufficient to have listed its beginning (Thesaurus vol. ii, p. 405, No. 3178). Another poetic work treated in the same way is the חזק יד of Solomon Ibn Mubhar.

A more difficult problem to deal with presented itself in the article contributed by Dr. Marmorstein in the *Kiryat Sepher* vol. ix, 379–387. He seems to have a way of relying on his memory which does not always serve him well. Thus on p. 379 he refers to the 4a in regard to the piyyut סליחה הורית אז ביום כפור (Thesaurus 2101) and to החלוץ vol. xi, p. 112 in regard to the poem אהלל אל לפי דעי ושכלי (Thesaurus 1449) but on examining these sources I found no reference whatever to these compositions. He has also a way of using secondary sources which lessens the value of his data. Of the 66 works which he lists as missing in the Thesaurus Nos. 54, 55, 60, 61 are cited from the *Hebräische Bibliographie*, and it is likely that a great many other books are cited by him from catalogues, as for instance, No. 10. Another defect in his data may be ascribed to haste or carelessness. Thus he lists three books (Nos. 33, 46, 55) as missing in my list of sources, but these are found in the Thesaurus on pp. xl, li, lix. In addition to all this many of the books he lists as missing do not come within the scope of my work for reasons stated in the preface to the first volume. He thinks that the Thesaurus ought to include also poems of modern times. But the very title of the book, "Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry" points to a different plan. One book, however, No. 29, I am including in this supplement, and eight others (6, 8, 13, 14, 22, 23, 54, 59) had been used by men in the first supplement before Dr. Marmorstein's article appeared in print.

The same signs of haste and carelessness are found in his notes which occupy pages 383–386. It would be too tedious to engage in a controversy over such details as inexact acrostics (Note 1 on p. 383), or his inexactness in describing sources (Notes 2, 3 on p. 383, where ספניילו and ספניילו is all that is given to describe a source not mentioned among the other sources listed on pp. 381–383). Nor need I dwell on the fact that a number of his addenda are either occasional poems (e. g. the notes

to pp. 216 and 349 of the Thesaurus), or of too recent a date (e. g. the notes to pp. 117 and 299 of the Thesaurus). But I cannot help singling out the following instances. On p. 384 in his note to p. 192 of the Thesaurus he brings a poem **אל תישן עורה** **מסעור חי'ן' שמעון שם חדש** from the book **והיה עלינו סתרה** (Cairo 1917 p. 290) and in his note to p. 309 of the Thesaurus he brings a poem **אנכי הנדתי והשמעתי** from the same book p. 286. As a matter of fact the lines he cites as beginnings of poems are taken from the middle of two poems; the first is from a poem beginning **מהלל** found in **שם חדש** on p. 289 and listed in the Thesaurus vol. iii, p. 99 No. 681, and the second is from the poem **יונת אלם רעיתי יפתי** found in **שם חדש** on p. 286 and listed in the Thesaurus vol. ii, p. 356, No. 2102. What misled Dr. Marmorstein to take the middle of a poem for a beginning is undoubtedly the fact that each of these lines happen to be at the top of a new page. Carelessness is also seen in the note to p. 238 of the Thesaurus. In the first place the source of his information is not **תפארת צבי** but **עטרת צבי** and the poem does not begin **עליו** but **אלף המון תלוי עלי** as given in the Thesaurus vol. ii p. 201, No. 483. In his note to p. 184 of the second volume of the Thesaurus he brings a poem **והנה תוך גללו נלל** but it is only a citation from a poem the beginning of which is not known. In his note to p. 239 of the same volume he brings a poem **חמס הזמן לשוא הזמן** and cites **המוכיר כ"א פ"ב** but no such poem can be found there. In his note to p. 407 of the same volume he brings the beginning of the preface to Rabbi Altschuler's **ס' ויחל משה** (Prague 1613) as a poem, but on examining the text I found that it is only a piece of rhymed prose and there is not the least justification to include it among poetic compositions. There are other items to which exception might be taken, but the above remarks are sufficient to show that I could not take his addenda without scrutinizing every one of them. For this reason a number of books and poems listed by him which I could not verify I chose to omit.

I might also mention that the late Rabbi S. S. Wertheimer in his notes to the Thesaurus which he appended to the third part of his **באור שמות הנרדפים שבתנ"כ** (Jerusalem 1932) pp. 105-116 shows undue haste in finding flaws. Thus e. g. on p. 108 he states

that I omitted to bring the poem **אש אוכלה אש** of Saadya Gaon, but there is no such poem. What he had in mind is the poem **אש אוכלה וניחרת אנכי אש אוכלה** which is found in the Thesaurus vol. i, p. 308, No. 6798.

I could go on pointing out flaws in several other reviews of the *Ozar*, but as I have no desire to make this preface an excuse for polemics, I will merely state, that wherever I found the reviewers justified I incorporated their corrections or additions in the previous supplement or in this, and where I had reason to disagree with them I disregarded their remarks. On the other hand, there may be a desire on the part of some scholars to form their own judgment on the merits of the reviews. For this reason, I append here a brief list of the reviews which appeared from time to time in addition to those already mentioned. In giving this list, I also wish to imply that each and every one of the reviews has made some contribution to the subject, more or less important.* I must not neglect to single out Mr. Rivkind's assist-

*For the sake of convenience the reviews are grouped in two divisions those written in Hebrew or Yiddish and those written in other languages, and each group is arranged alphabetically according to authors.

1. בלוך (יהושע). כנוס הפיוט (חורב ערוך ע"י פ. חורגין כרך ב' עמ' 312-310).
2. בערנשטיין (שמעון). פון דער ביכער וועלט (די צוקונפט רעדאקטירט פון א. לעסיין מאי 1925 עמ' 316-314).
3. ברנשטיין (שמעון). אוצר השירה והפיוט (הדאר כרך י' גליון כ' עמ' 321-319).
4. ברנשטיין (שמעון). אוצר השירה והפיוט (הדאר כרך י"ג גליון כ"ז עמ' 427-426).
5. בהרמן (א. מ.) גליונות י"ל ע"י יצחק למדן כרך רביעי חוברת ז'-ח' (תלאביב, אדר-ניסן תרצ"ז) עמ' 112-109.
6. ווערטהיימער (שלמה אהרן). בית האוצר השירה (נלוה לס' באור שמות הנרדפים שבחנ"כ, ירושלם תרצ"ז, עמ' ק"ה-קט"ז).
7. ילין (רוד). אוצר השירה והפיוט (קרית ספר כרך י' עמ' 348-346).
8. יערי (אברהם). מלואים ל' אוצר השירה והפיוט (קרית ספר כרך י"א עמ' 251-245).
9. יערי (אברהם). מפעל אדירים (מאונים כרך ג', תלאביב, חשון תרצ"ה, עמ' 229-226).
10. כהן (צבי). דער אוצר פון אידישער פאעזיע (דאס אידישע פאלק י"ב שבט תרפ"ה עמ' 9).
11. כהנא (אברהם). על אוצר השירה והפיוט (הישוב, שבועון מרגיני ספרותי בעריכת ברידורא, תלאביב, כ"ט ניסן תרפ"ה עמ' 12-11).
12. לוין (כ. מ.). אוצר השירה והפיוט (קרית ספר כרך ז' עמ' 121-118).
13. מרמורשטיין (אברהם). הוספות ומלואים ל' אוצר השירה והפיוט (קרית ספר כרך ט' עמ' 387-379).
14. פלאטו (רוב). שירת ישראל הנשכחת (הארץ, י"ד חשון תרצ"ד).
15. פרענקיל (רוד). אוצר השירה והפיוט (עלים לביבליוגרפיה ולקורות ישראל ערוך ע"י דוד פרענקיל שנה א', וינה תרצ"ד-תרצ"ה, עמ' 4-2).

ance, for in addition to his review he put at my disposal a number of additions which he had gathered and as one of the staff of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary has given much of his time and energy to help me in my research. I also wish to thank Dr. Benjamin Klar of Jerusalem for sending me five rare pamphlets compiled by David S. Zemah of Baghdad which yielded a number of additions.

This new supplement does not, of course, bring the *Ozār* to a close. As new material will continue to be brought to light from time to time the record of achievement of the poets of the middle ages will likewise continue to grow and possibly in a decade from now there will be enough new material to justify a third supplement, and the fuller the record the better equipped will be he who will come to write the history of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry, a task, which, by the way, I have never entirely relinquished.

March 9, 1937.

16. צפרוני (א.). אוצר השירה והפיוט (מאונים, שבועון, כרך ב', גליון מ"ז-מ"ח עמ' 21).
17. ריבקינד (יצחק). אוצר השירה והפיוט (הדאר שנה רביעית גליון ו' עמ' 10-9).
18. ריבקינד (יצחק). אוצר השירה והפיוט (העולם שנה כ"א גליון ל"ב עמ' 480-479).
19. שמחוני (י. נ.). אוצר השירה והפיוט (התקופה כרך כ"ג עמ' 504-506).
1. Elbogen, I. "Thesaurus etc." (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. LXIX, 1925, pp. 331-333).
2. Idem. Idem (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung* June 13, 1925).
3. Idem. Idem (*Ibid.* 1929 pp. 2436-2437).
4. Idem. Idem (*Ibid.* 1931 pp. 2368-2369).
5. Mann, Jacob, "Davidson's Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry" (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, N. S. vol. XVI, pp. 94-98).
6. Marx, Alexander. "Thesaurus etc." *United Synagogue Recorder* vol. V, No. 1 pp. 18-19).
7. Perles, F. "Thesaurus etc." (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 1925 p. 904).
8. Sassoon, David S. "Thesaurus etc." (*JQR.* vol. XXI pp. 89-150).
9. Idem. Idem (*JQR.* vol. XXII pp. 417-424).
10. Spiegel, Shalom. "A monument of Jewish Scholarship" (*The Menorah Journal*, 1934, Spring Number, pp. 69-72).

מקורות עברים חדשים

1. **אוצר הגאונים** תשובות גאוני בבל ופירושיהם על פי סדר התלמוד. ערוך ע"י דר. ב. מ. לוין. חיפה תרפ"ח.
2. **אוצר ישראל** אנציקלופדיא לכל מקצעות תורת ישראל ספרותו ודבריו ימיו. ערוך ע"י יהודה דוד איזענשטיין. ניו יארק תרס"ז-תרע"ג.
3. **אזהרות לר"י בן ראובן** עם אזהרות לרשב"ג. ליוורנו 1842.
4. **אַלְמָה** מאסף האגודה למדעי היהדות בירושלים. ערוך ע"י ב. מ. לוין. מאסף ראשון ירושלים תרצ"ז.
- אמת לעקב** ע"י Festschrift J. Freimann.
5. **אמתאל אל דאודייה** י"ל ע"י דויד ס. צמח. בנדאד; ח"ב כסליו תרפ"ח; ח"ג אדר ב' תרפ"ט; ח"ד תמוז תרפ"ט.
- אָרְמַן** ע"י Ormann, G.
6. **בית הלל** באור על ש"ע י"ד ואה"ע. הר' הלל בר נפתלי הערץ. דיהרנפורט 1691.
7. **בכורים מנחה חדשה** כולל סדר חג השבועות . . . ואזהרות לרשב"ג ור"י בן ראובן. וויען 1889.
- בערנהיימר** רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא ע"י Bernheimer Codices.
8. **בקשות ושירה** חלק שני מן לימוד לחנוכת הבית נחמד השער ולא נודע לי מחברו ולא מקום זמן הדפסתו.
9. **גורל העשיריות** המיוחס לרב צמח בר רב אחאי גאון. י"ל ע"י מאיר יהושע ראזענבערג. ווארשא תרס"ד.
10. **גינבורג-מארעק**. "ברייסקיא נאראדניא פיעסני וו ראסיי מאת שאול מ. גינבורג ופ. ש. מארעק. ס"ט. פטרבורג 1901.
11. **גנזי שירה** ופיוט מראשי הפייטנים והמשוררים הקדמונים סדורים ע"י יוסף מרקוס. ניו יורק 1933.
12. **דבר** עתון פועלי ארץ ישראל. העורך ב. כצנלסון. תל אביב.
- דו"ח של האקאדעמיע**. ע"י Proceedings of the American Academy.

13. **דיואן – ר"א הבבלי** י"ל ע"י חיים בראדי. ירושלם תרצ"ה. [בדיואן הנדפס שינה המו"ל את סדר השירים אחר ס' קצ"א, ויש שצריך להוסיף או לגרוע מספר אחד מן המספר המובא באוצר השירה כדי להתאים עם המספר בדיואן הנדפס. המו"ל הוסיף ג"כ שירי ר"א הבבלי ממקורות אחרים שלא נמצאו בכ"ג. השירים האלו מובאים בהוספות אלו על פי סימני הדיואן הנדפס.]
 14. **דיואן – שבזי** קובץ שירי קדש של שלום שבזי. יפו 1931.
 15. **דמיון הרפואות** מאת אברהם רופא וואליך. פ"פ דמיון 1700.
 16. **דרך חיים – לונזאנו** כולל שירים למנחם די לונזאנו. נדפס מחדש בהוספת תולדות המחבר מאת מאיר וואנדר. לכוב 1931.
 17. **הברמן – תפלות** מעין שמונה עשרה י"ל ע"י אברהם מאיר הברמן. ברלין 1933.
 18. **הגדה – 1716**. סדר הגדה של פסח בלה"ק ולשון איטליאני. ד"ו תע"ז.
 19. **הַרְגֵנוּ**. ספר היובל י"ל ע"י הסתדרות תלמידי ישיבת רבנו יצחק אלחנן. ניו יורק תרצ"ו.
 20. **ההד** ירחון ליהדות ולבנין הארץ. ירושלם.
 21. **וזאת ליהודה** קובץ מאמרים בחכמת ישראל ליובל השבעים של יהודה לייב לנדא. תל אביב, תרצ"ז.
 22. **זבח תודה – קושטא**. זבח תודה פרישת דרישת האלפא ביתא רבתי. הר' שמואל אריפול. קושטא חש"ד.
- זולאי** ע"י Zulay.
23. **חבורי לקוטים** אשר חיבר על גפ'ת הר' זעליג בר יצחק אייזק מרגליות. ד"ו תע"ה.
 24. **חופת חתנים – קוגין**. ספר חופת חתנים והוא קובץ פיוטים ופזמונים לחופה. להבדלה ולמילה כמנהג ק"ק קוגין. הוצאה חדשה עם פ' נפתלי אליה רחבי. בומבי 1917.
 - כולל ג' חלקים: ח"א לחופה 77 עמ'; ח"ב להבדלה 14 עמ'; ח"ג למילה 22 עמ' 3] עמ' נוספים בראש הספר ועוד 3 עמ' בסוף הספר.]
 25. **חורב** מאסף מוקדש לתולדות ישראל וספרותו. מופיע פעמים בשנה. העורך פ. חורגין. ניו יורק 1934.
 26. **זה ספר חפץ חיים** באור שחבר ר' יחיא בן שלום קרח על שירי שלום בן יוסף שבזי. תל אביב 1932. [ב' חלקים – ח"א נסמן עפ"י הרפים וח"ב עפ"י מספר השירים.]
 27. **טהרת הנפש** לזכות את נשמת האדם בתפילות . . . יצחק בן משה די פאסיצו. אמשטרדם 1734.
 28. **טורים – האנוואה** 1610.

29. **טורים-קרימונה**. ארבעה טורים לר' יעקב בן ר' אשר ז"ל. קרימונה 1558.
- ידיעות המכון** עי' Mitteilungen d. Forschungs-instituts.
30. **יורה דעה** 1551. יו"ד עם חדושי ר' יוסף קארו. ד"ו 1551.
31. **יפה תאר**-1657. פי' על שמות רבה. ר' שמואל יפה אשכנזי. ד"ו 1657.
32. **כה לחי חמשה ועשרים** אמרי חכמה ומשלי מוסר יו"ל ע"י חיים בראדי, ברלין, תרצ"ד.
33. **כפא-כ"י**. מחזור לר"ה יוכ"פ וסכות כפי מנהג כפא. מחזיק קע"ב דפים מנייר ירוק. הכ"י נלקח בחסר בין דף 10-11, 26-27, 42-43, 137-138. יש בו 30 פיוטים שלא נדפסו עד כה. השוה מאמרו של יצחק דובער מארקאן בס' זכרון לאברהם אליהו הרכבי. פטרבורג תרס"ט עמ' 449-469. [הכ"י שייך לי].
34. **כתאב ורוד** אל ראודייה מלאהי אדבייה י"ל ע"י דויד ס. צמח. בגדאד. ח"א תרפ"ו ח"ב תרפ"ז.
- לוח-שוקן** עי' Almanach-Schoken.
- לימוד לחנכת הבית** עי' בקשות ושירה.
- לעווי-רשימה** עי' H. Loewe—Catalogue, etc.
35. **לקט שירים** ופיוטים. מוגש למיכה יוסף שוקן בהכנסו לתורה ולמצות. ירושלם 1936.
36. **מאיר בת עין-בגדאד** והוא לקוטי הלכות של ר' מאיר בעל הנס. בגדאד תרס"ה.
37. **מאמרים-חיות**. מאמרים לזכרון ר' צבי פרץ חיות ז"ל מאת אוהביו ומכבדיו. וינא תרצ"ג.
38. **מבחר-שירמן** מבחר השירה העברית באיטליה י"ל ע"י חיים שירמן. ברלין תרצ"ד.
39. **מחקרים** לזכרון ר' עמרם קאהוט. י"ל ע"י ש. בארון וא. מארכס. ניו יורק תרצ"ו. (Jewish Studies—Kohut).
40. **מליץ טוב** . . . תפלות בקשות ותחנונים י"ל ע"י דוד ציון לניאדו. ירושלם 1926.
41. **מנחה לדוד** קובץ מאמרים בחכמת ישראל מוגש ליובל השבעים של ר' דוד ילין. ירושלם תרצ"ה.
42. **ספר מעורר אהבה** והוא נוסח הכתובה לחג השבועות כמנהג ירושלים שנוהגים לאומרו קודם קריאת התורה. פירינצי 1749.
- מערב ומזרח** עי' Occident and Orient.
43. **מפי אהרן** שו"ת לר' אהרן בכור אלחדיף. ירושלם 1907.
- נוביוער-צלומים** עי' Neubauer—Facsimilies.

44. **משא קרים** כולל קורות בני ישראל בחצי האי קרים... מאת אפרים דיינארד
ווארשא 1878.
45. **נחלת שבעה** כולל דברי הטור א"ע וש"ע בעניני נטין וקדושין, ר' שמואל דוד הלוי.
אמשט' 1667; פוירדא 1754.
46. **סדור כנסת הגדולה** (כנה"ג) עם בית רחל... ווילנא תרמ"ט.
47. **סדר הלימוד לליל שבועות**. רעדלהיים 1830.
48. **סדר זמירות ולימוד**... בחנכת בית הכנסת... פה סינה. נסדר מפי ירדיה
לוי ור' יצחק חיים מדינה. ליורנו 1786.
49. **סדר נאה** ומתקבל... ביום אשר חזרו ספרי תורות... בבה"כ של ס' פרי עדים.
פירינצי 1849.
- סדר תחנונים**. קול תפלה קו"ל תחנה בני חבר' מלביש ערומים שבב"ה אשכנזים מן
השוק שבק"ק מורונא... נדפס מחדש מנטובה 1737. עי' **תחנונים**—1717.
50. **סדר תפלות**—1681 סדר תפלות מכל השנה עם פי' כמנהג פולין רייסין ליטא...
אמשטרדם תמ"א.
51. **סילחה משובחה אשר פי' ה' יקבנה בשם שמעון לילדים**. הר' שמעון בן משלם
זלמן [פישוויף מויען]. פראנקפורט 1711.
52. **ספר היובל לר' שמעון יהודה שקאפ**. מוגש ע"י תלמידיו ומוקיריו.
ווילנא תרצ"ו.
53. **ספר היובל לפרופיסור שמואל קרויס** למלאת לו שבעים שנה י"ל ע"י ועד
היובל בירושלם. ירושלם תרצ"ז.
54. **ספר השנה הסתדרות בני ארץ ישראל באמריקה**. ניו יורק תרצ"ה.
עדעלמן עי' Edelman, R.
55. **עובר אורח** דינים קצרים לעוברי דרך י"ל ע"י שמעון בר מאיר כהמשך מן קצור סמ"ג.
קארלסרוא 1763.
56. **העולם**. נערך ע"י משה קליינמן. לונדון—ירושלם.
57. **עיר גבורים** דרשות על התורה לר' אפרים בן אהרן לונטשיץ. באסליה 1580.
58. **עלים** לכיבויגורפיה וקורות ישראל. י"ל ד' פעמים בשנה ע"י דוד פרענקיל.
וינה תרצ"ד—תרצ"ה.

59. **פ-יא** ספר פזמונים. חסר השער ומתחיל בעמוד 3. סופו מניע בעמוד 215 ושם נמצאה החתימה: „המסדר משה יעקב עייאש הי״ו. אחרי כן בא: „מפתחות הנותנות באמרי שפר לשיר לדודי אשכול הכופר“. המפתח מתחיל בעמ' 216 ומניע רק עד עמ' 222, סוף המפתחות חסר. נדפס בארצות המזרח במאה הי"ט. (נמצא בספריה שלי).
60. **פיוטי יניי** לשמע ישראל. קרובה לסדר דברים ו', ד'. יל ע"י מנחם זולאי. ברלין תרצ"ג. 19 עמ'.
61. **פיוטים ספרדיים** חדשים מתקופת הזהב מתפרסמים ע"י שמעון ברנשטיין ועלים ב' (57-78) ובהוצאה מיוחדת. וינה תרצ"ו. 22 עמוד.
62. **פלגי מים** משה הכהן פורטו. ד"ו שס"ח (1608).
63. **צדוק הדין** נדבת החברה של גמילות חסדים ק"ק אשכנזים ועוד בקשה חברה ריא"ם. ד"ו 1758.
64. **צינבערג-געשיכטע** די געשיכטע פון דער ליטעראטור ביי יידן. דר. ישראל צינבערג. ווילנע 1920.
65. **צמח צדיק-ליורנו**. שרשו פתוח אלי מים חיים ס' חמדת ימים. ליורנו 1784.
66. **קינת סופדים** חבורה עתה מחדש מאת יצחק בן יעקב מן הלויים. ד"ו 1643.
67. **קרה מקרה** והוא תיקון לפנס הקרי מלוקט מתורת הארי"ע ע"י מאיר בן חליפה ביקיאים המשך מן צמח צדיק... ליורנו 1784 (דף צ"ד-ק').
- רודפי צדק ע"י אלה הדברים** במפתח המקורות לכרך א.
68. **רמב"ע-דיואן** משה אבן עזרא שירי החל יו"ל ע"י חיים בראדי. ברלין תרצ"ה.
69. **רנה ותפלה** של חינוך בה"כ של איטליאני. חנניה אלחנן חי כהן. פירינצי 1828.
70. **רשויות לחתן** חוברו ע"י פיטני אשכנז הראשונים. י"ל ע"י שלמה זלמן שוקן. זכרון ברכה לבנו החתן מרדכי יהודה שוקן ולבת גילו הכלה שולמית לבית פרסיץ ליום חתונתם י"ג כסלו תרצ"ו. תל אביב תרצ"ו. [נדפס במהדורה של מאה טפסים תמונת פאליא 64 עמוד].
71. **רשימה-שירמן** רשימת הפיוטים הצרופה למאמרו של ח. שירמן: „אסף פיוטים מחורקה בספריה הלאומית“ (קרית ספר שנה י"ב עמ' 389, 516) ובהדפסה מיוחדת עמ' 1-17) מן הרשימה הזאת מובאים כאן רק הפיוטים שאינם ידועים ממקום אחר.
- רשימת כ"י של כה"ק ע"י** Harkvay & Strack. Catalog.
72. **שאלות שאול הכהן**. ד"ו 1574.

73. שיר חדש—ה ספר שיר חדש וקול בוכים והוא קבוצת שירים, פיוטים וקנים ... אשר כוננו ידי ר' רפאל משה אלבאז ... ירושלם [1930].
74. שיר ידידות—ד'. לכבוד ר' נחמן ותלמידו ר' נתן ... מאת ישראל בר יהודה הלוי המכונה קארדאן. ירושלם 1907.
75. שירי דוד שירים על ענינים שונים. דוד הכהן. ליוורנו 1902.
76. שירי רמב"ע שירי משה בן יעקב אבן עזרא מקובצים ע"י ח. נ. ביאליק וי. ח. רבניצקי ספר ראשון שירי חול. ירושלם תרפ"ח.
77. שירת משה—ב'. שיר על תרי"ג מצות. משה מייזלש. ירושלם 1907.
78. ש"ך על יו"ד—קראקא 1646.
79. שלום ירושלם סדור כמנהג ספרדים יוצאי המערב והמזרח. ירושלם 1927.
80. שער השמים תקון המשניות. ליוורנו 1762.
81. שערי דורא לר' יצחק מדורא. ד"ו 1647.
82. שפ"ת אמת תקון לעד ביום שמחת תורה. חיד"א. ליוורנו 1800.
83. תהלות לאל בקשות לשבתות ולמועדים ... הנוהגים לאומרם בארצות המערב. ירושלם 1932. (מכורך עם סדור שלום ירושלם סי' 79 לעיל.)
84. תודת שלמים נחלק לשני חלקים. ח"א נקרא זבחי תודה ... ח"ב נקרא לחמי תודה. ד"ו תק"א.
85. תולדות הדפוס העברי בפולניא מאת חיים דובעריש פריעדבערג. אנטוורפן תרצ"ב.
86. תורה—קראקא תורה עם פי' רש"י רמב"ן ור"י אבוהב. קראקא 1687.
87. תושבחתא שירתא בשלימו דעבדתא ... מאת מנחם בר יצחק נוויירה. אמ"ד 1758.
88. תקופתנו במה למחשבה ויצירה עברית בעריכת משה קליינמאן. לונדון תרצ"ב.

מקורות לועזים חדשים

89. ALMANACH des Schocken Verlags auf das Jahr 5694. Berlin 1933/4 (לוח-שוקן).
90. BERNHEIMER, CARLO. Codices Hebraici Bibliothecae Ambrosianae. Florentiae 1933. (בערנהיימר—רשימת כ"י) (אמברוזיאנא).
91. CATALOG DER HEBRÄISCHEN BIBELHANDSCHRIFTEN der Kaiserlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Peterburg von A. Harkavy und H. L. Strack. St. Peterburg 1875. (רשימת כ"י של כה"ק).
92. EDELMAN, RAFAEL. Zur Frühgeschichte des Mahzor. Frankfurt a. M. 1933. (ערעלמן).
93. FESTSCHRIFT JAKOB FREIMANN zum 70 Geburtstag. Berlin 1937.
JEWISH STUDIES IN MEMORY OF G. A. KOHUT. N. Y. 1936. (מחקרים).
94. LOEWE, HERBERT. Catalogue of the MSS. in the Hebrew Character collected and bequeathed to Trinity College Library by W. A. Wright. Cambridge 1926. (לעווי—רשימה).
95. MITTEILUNGEN DES FORSCHUNGSINSTITUTS für hebräische Dichtung. Vol. I–III Berlin 1933–1936. (ידיעות המכון).
96. NEUBAUER, A. (5) Facsimiles of Heb. MSS. in Bodleian Library, Oxford 1886. (נויבויער—צלומים).
97. OCCIDENT AND ORIENT being studies in Semitic philology and literature . . . in honour of M. Gaster's 80th birthday. Edited by Bruno Schindler in collaboration with A. Marmorstein. London 1936. (מערב ומזרח).
98. ORMANN, GUSTAV. Das Sündenbekenntniss des Veröhnungstages, sein Aufbau und sein Entwicklung in Verbindung mit Geniza-Texten untersucht. Frankfurt a. M. 1934. (ארמן).
99. PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY FOR JEWISH RESEARCH. (דו"ח של האקאדעמיע).
100. ZULAY, MENAHEM. Zur Liturgie der babylonischen Juden. Stuttgart 1933. (זולאי).

מלוואים חדשים

לאוצר השירה והפיוט

1. א... ימללה... א... בר... ון ואין... אהרן ל(כה)ן.—שריד
מפיוט. — ס' א"ב. *עדעלמן 27.
2. א... רתי ב... דוק וארק.—ח'ז מקרובה שראשיתה חסרה. — ס' א"ב.
*זולאי 81.
3. אאדיר כבוד ה' היום יום ראשון.—ס' א"ב (בחרוים א, ג, ה, וכו') נפתלי
הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוים ב, ד, ו, וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 57.
4. אב אתה לאביונים לעם שומרי אמונים.—ס' אבטליון. *פ-יא 27.
‡אב המון ואזרח.—ע"י אשל טע אזרח.
5. אב רחמן נקראת חנון ומאוד נעלת רחום.—ס' אבטליון. *פ-יא 5.
6. אב רחמן עורה נשגב ונבדל.—ס' אני יצחק. *רשימה-שירמן 1.
‡אבד אשר תאדיף.—ח"ד מן השבעתא: אומן מצורים אל חקתה.
7. אבדו ישרי חומותי ושורי.—ס' א"ב, דויד בן נשיא. *חקופתנו 465.
8. אבוא היום להקריב ניב שפתי.—[רפאל משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה 58.
9. אבי למתי יגבר מעני.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 23.
10. אבי מעוז ראשי צמאה לך נפשי.—ס' אני רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר
חדש-ה 5.
- ‡אבי צדק שמע פירוש שאלה.—המשך של השיר: אנא אדון עולם אשר אמר.
11. אביגדור בירך למ... ת איתיו.—קרובה לסדר הזאת הברכה.
הערה: מן הקרובה הזאת נשארה רק החלק הראשון ס' א-ל; החתימה: אברכם
בארבע פיניי, והתחלת החלק השני: מצדקת אבות ישיני מכפלה. *זולאי 82.
12. אביעה חידות חדשות אני מגיד.—ס' אני רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר
חדש-ה 22.
13. אביעה מעש מחזיק כל בדק.—[יוחנן יהודה אלטרין]. *מבחר-שירמן 256.
14. אביעה שיר ותהילה בפי יגיד תהלתו.—ס' אבטליון. *פ-יא 130.
15. אביר כביר צור נעלה מלכותך בכל משלה.—ס' אני יצחק שמואל.
*פ-יא 192.

16. **אביר נאמן רחמן נאמן בנה משכן.**—פ*—יא⁵¹.
17. **אביר תהלות רחמן אגדיל גבורות נאמן.**—סי' אבר [הם]. *רשימה—שירמן³.
אבירי ארץ יאמירו בערץ (259).—אמת ליעקב¹⁴³.
18. **אבכה במר אף בשרי עלי יכאב.**—קינה על אברהם מאמאן—סי' רפאל
[משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה⁶⁵.
19. **אבכה במר ומורש לבבי אבתר.**—קינה על אחותו—סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן].
*שיר חדש—ה⁶⁸.
20. **אבכה יום בו שכב מחזק כל בדק.**—קינה על רפאל מאמאן—סי' רפאל
[משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה' ⁶⁶.
21. **אבל אנחנו אשמים וחטאים בושים ונכלמים.**—סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה⁹⁷.
22. **אבלה יהודה והיתה נדודה.**—קינה סי' א"ב. *תקופתנו⁴⁵³.
23. **אבלה נפשי חשך אור שמשי.**—קינה על אברהם מאמאן. סי' אני רפאל משה
[אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה' ⁶⁵.
24. **... אבלים ועדתם אבל ורעיו נם צור להלום מכשיליו.**—שריד
מקרובה לת"ב נוסדה על ישעיה ס"א, א'. לפי זה היתה התחלת הבית הראשון: „רוח”
והתחלת הבית השני „אדני” וכן הלאה, כפי סדר התיבות בפסוק הנ"ל. הפיוט בשלמותו
החזיק י"ח מחרוזות בעלי ד' בתים, כנגד י"ח הברכות שבשמונה עשרה לפי נוסח ארץ
ישראל. בשני בתים הראשונים של כל מחרוזת בא סי' הא"ב (כפול) אחרי התיבות של
הפסוק בישעיה, ובשני בתים האחרונים בא שמו של הפייטן בר"ת (כל אות כפולה). ומכיון
שהשריד מתחיל באמצע הברכה הי"ב של י"ח הברכות מוכח שחסרים י"ב אותיות מן סי'
הא"ב וי"א אותיות מן סי' שם הפייטן. מה שנשאר מן סימן השם הוא **ו ש ע ה חזק**.
לפי זה אי אפשר להסכים עם המו"ל ששמו של הפייטן היה יהושע (חורב, א' ³¹) כי בוראי
בא שמו בראש הפיוט ולא בסופו וצ"ע. ואולי הוא הפיטן אהרן בר יהושע שפיוט שלו:
„אל נורא עלילה שוכן שמי זבולה” נדפס ב„גנוי שירה” עמ' ¹¹³, וא"כ אפשר שבפיוט שלפנינו
חתם שמו: „אני אהרן בר יהושע חזק”. *חורב—א' ¹⁶³.
25. **אכנט וחגור בעיזומים בעבור גינת אגוזים.**—חלק מסדר עבודה ליוכ"פ—
סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה⁷⁰.
26. **אברך אל בחר בנו במצותיו קדשנו חג שבועות נתן לנו.**—
סי' אברהם. *פ—יא¹⁰².
27. **אברך את ה' היום יום שני כי הוא אחד ואין שני.**—סי' תשר"ק (בחרוים
א, ג, ה, וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוים ב, ד, ה, וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג
ח"ג⁵⁸.

28. אברך לאל עליון נתן בפי הגיון.—פ*—יא⁴⁶.
29. אברך נא בבר ידי י"י יצרני ולו נשמת ישני.—שיר כסדר התפלה מיוחס לראב"ע. *לקט שירים¹².
30. אברכה את י"י תמיד בכל עת בתפילה.—סי' אהרן. *פ—יא⁴⁰.
- †אגבר חילים ויתרון הכשר חכמה.—עי' אגיד תהלות ה' היום יום השלישי. אגודה מילדי הערונות (421).—רמב"ע—דיואן¹⁶⁰.
32. אגודי לעבוד עבודה בכבוד.—סי' אלעזר בירבי קלר. *חורב א'¹⁵⁹; גנוי שירה²¹.
33. אגודים בחיבה תועצם שמחתכם.—ח' מן הקרובה לקליר: אהבת נעורים מעולם—סי' א"ב. *הארץ י"ג כסלו תרצ"ז.
34. אגיד תהלות ה' היום יום השלישי.—סי' את"בש (בחרוזים א, ג, ה, וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוזים ב, ד, ו, וכו'). *סדור כנח"ג ח"ג⁵⁸.
- אן הסהר נוקשת שער (447).—סי' א"ב. *אמת ליעקב¹³³.
35. אד יעלה מן הארץ שלישייתו . . . ושלישייתו מטר.—חלק מקרובה—סי' א"ב (מאות עין נמצא בכ"י אדלר³²⁹⁷). *גנוי שירה⁸³.
36. אדבר וירוח לי לפני צורי וגואלי ינחני במעגלי צדק.—סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש—ה'¹³.
- †אדבר לה' דברי זאת השירה.—עי' אדרוש את ה' היום יום הרביעי.
37. אדבר נא כי צר לבבי עם כל צר.—[שמואל בן יוסף נ' שושן]. *מנחה לדוד²⁰⁰.
38. אדברה וירוח לי אתודה על חטאתי.—תוכחה—סי' א"ב יוסף בר מתתיה. *תרביץ ז'¹⁸³.
39. אדום הלחי ברודה קצף ונסע מגבולי.—שיר אזור [שמואל הנגיד] *דיעות המכון ב'¹⁴⁰.
40. אדום מריבי ומשל בחזק מרי בי.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון²⁰.
41. אדומה רבו צרותיה ככן בטלו מצוותיה.—חלק מן שבעתא לסכות שראשיתה בלתי נודעה—סי' א"ב. *ספר היובל לקרויס³⁰⁸.

42. אדון במדון וכידון ישכון בתוך הרחובות.—תלונה בלכתו בגולה. [נמשה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 374; מבחר—שירמן 240.
43. אדון יצור עזוז וצור בחסדך עוזר.—פתיחה לשיר: לכו אל תעמדו רוכב סוס [מנחם די לונזאנו]. *שתי ידות 85: (הרף נסמן בטעות פ"א); דרך חיים—לונזאנו 8.
44. אדון כנגלה משמי גבוהים ביאר לעם ישע כמהים.—יוצר. סי' א'—וי"ו, פ', ז'—ל', י', מ'—צ', נ', ק'—ח', ח' ס' (=א"ב פינחס). *זולאי 36, 85—87 והערת ש. ח. קוק בקרית ספר י"א 79.
45. אדון משמך למען שמך תוריד גשמך.—ע"י 1. אדון שוכן ערבות. 2. אזור נא גבורות.
46. אדון נפשי גאלני ואל קדשך תנהלני.—סי' אברהם [ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ ה' 71.
47. אדון עולם ברחמים נהלני ומעמקי תהומות בחסדך דלני.—[ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ ה' 70.
48. אדון רוכב שבעה בתחן וברחמים נשוועה.—זולת לר"ה—סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה 93.
49. אדון שוכן ערבות פתח לנו ארובות.—פיוט לגשם. סי' א'—וי"ו. *מחקרים 176.
50. אדון שמע מזקנים בזו לעוגב ומנים.—שיר בחוך מחברת העשירית של ספר המוסר' לזכריה אלצאהרי. *יריעות המכון נ' 209.
51. ה' אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו בחסדיך הרבים אוכה היום לגשת לפני מקום מקדשך החרב והשומם.—תפלה שחברה בשביל עצמו לאמרה ליד הכותל המערבי כשעלה שנית לארץ ישראל בסוף אלול תרמ"ד. אליעזר מרדכי אלטשולר. *דאר היום גליון רצ"ו, כ"ט אלול תרצ"ג.
52. ה' בקר ערוך לך.—סי' שלמה גדין חזק. *רשימה—שירמן 6.
53. אדני מלכנו הוא יושענו. מבצר החרב קומם (907).—סי' משה כהן [אבן נקטילה]. *יריעות המכון ג' 73.
54. ה' מלכנו מלך אל חי וקים.—חלק מן עזרת אבותינו והוא במקום ה' ימלך. *אלבון—תולדות התפלה 22 בספר האשכנזי עמ' 24.
55. י"י קדשו זמנו טהרו לכפרה.—מסתאניב. *פיוטים ספרדיים 14.
56. ה' שוכן גבוהים חדררי לב וטוחות חופש.—סי' רפאל משה יצ"ו [אלבאן]. *שיר חרש—ה' 27.

56. ה' שמע נא את קולנו חוסה וגם רחם עלינו. אלהינו בך בטחו אבותינו.—סליחה. סי' א"ב. *חורב ב' 204.
57. אדיר ה' אדירנו ברוך ברכנו.—סי' א"ב (אותיות פ'—ק' חסרות) נהמ'ל מיחסו לסעיד בן מרחב בלי יסוד נכון]. *תקופתנו 459.
58. אדיר אלהינו אדירה התורה.—שיר עממי בעברית ויהודית. *גינבורג—מארעק סי' 18.
59. אדיר יבנה בית מצמיח ישועה.—סי' א"ב. *פ—יא 150.
60. אדיר מלך שמעה פירי אמרתי ושיר שירי.—*פ—יא 202.
61. אדם אם יהיה פרוץ ושפתיו חטות.—ח'ו מן הקרובה: אלפתח לעם חשוקיך—סי' א"ב. *וולאי 31.
62. אדם . . . בשעתה דאתפקד אשלים נפשה.—אפטרסה למיתה—סי' שמות האבות מן אדם עד שלמה וסי' א"ב. *וולאי 37.
63. אדם היה שפל ונדכה כי שכל בלב שפל מנוחתו.—*כה לחי 1.
64. אדם זכור ואל תשכח יום מותך נחשים ועקרבים יבואו לקראתך.—סי' אני ליב רופא שליט וואליך. *דמיון הרפואות 8.
65. אדמה מעשה תבל אשר כל אנוש תם בחלקלקות הסיתו.—*מאמר השכל (בתוך ההקדמה) [על זה העירני מר א. אברונין].
66. אדר נולי ישע תזיל להמוניי.—שמונה עשרה לראש השנה לאילנות—סי' א"ב (כל אות עד פ'א ג' פעמים) צ—ת (פעם אחת). [יהודה הלוי ברבי הלל]. *לקט שירים 16.
67. אדרוש את ה' היום יום הרביעי, כי הוא משגבי וצור מושיעי.—סי' א"ב (בחרוזים א, ג, ה, וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוזים ב, ד, ו, וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 59.
68. אדרת מעטה הוד והדר כאיתן יאופד חתן.—ח"ו מן הקרובה לקליר: אהבת נעורים מעולם—סי' א"ב. *הארץ י"ג כסלו תרצ"ז.
69. אהבת נעורים מעולם במתחתנים היום תיקשר לעולם.—קדושתה לחתן. [קליר.] חלקי הקרובה: א. (מנן): אהבת נעורים—סי' א—ל; כרוג: יצליח לעד נצר מטעינו. ב. (מחיה): מפרי מעיהם יגילו וישמחו—סי' מ—ת; כרוג: ויצליחו בכל מקח ומתן. ג. (משלש): אחותי כלה בחופתה תשמח—סי' אלעזר חזק; חתימה: כליה העדה כמאז להתכללה—סי' הודיה חזק. ד. ישמח ויגיל לב סגולה—בלי סימן. ה. אחותי כלה או

- תחנון-ס' אלעזר בירבי קליר. ו. אגודים בחיבה תועצם שמחתכם-ס' א"ב. ז. אדרת מעשה הוד והדר כאיתן יאופד חתן-ס' א"ב. *ננוי שירה 46 [מגיע רק עד אמצע שורה ח' מן חלק ה']; הארץ י"ג כסלו תרצ"ו [מביא החלקים ה, ו, ז].
70. אהג כפתי ובער בפתיות וביער. — שריר מרשות-ס' א' ו'. *חורב ב' 10.
71. אהה איך אעלה לדין לאבי וחטאתי לנגדי יעמדו. — (יותר לא נמצא). [יהודה אבן גיאת?] *ידיעות המכון ב' 192.
72. אהה כמה מצא חנך אשבר. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 225.
73. אהה קנא זמן כילי ושאף להכחיד הנדבות בחרי אף. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 31.
74. אהוב עושה נסים אלוה מעשים. — ס' א"ב. *חפץ חיים ח"ב ס' נ"ד.
75. אהובים באהבם דת מזהב ומכסף. — ח"ו מן הקרובה: אחריו המשכחה קהלים (נשאר רק בית אחד). *זולאי 36.
76. אהובתי בין הבנות במצרים ירדו אבות. — ס' אשחרו. *פ-יא 46.
77. אהל מותח עפרי בקרבי. — [שדרוס אבאלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 87.
78. אהליבה הבנויה צור יגלה יצמיח. — פיוט לטל-ס' אברהם בן יצחק חזן [האיי גאון חברו על שם האיש הזה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 52.
79. אהלל את ה' היום יום חמישי כי הוא כבודי ומרים ראשי. — ס' תשר"ק (בחרוזים א' ג' ה' וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוזים ב, ד, ו, וכו') *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 60.
80. אהללה כל יכול עילת כל עילה. — ס' אברהם חזק. *פ-יא 34.
81. אודה את ה', היום יום הששי, כי הוא בוחן לבבי ומאזין לחשי. — ס' את"בש (בחרוזים א, ג, ה, וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוזים ב' ד' ו' וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 60.
82. אודה לשמך יה יה אספר מהללך. — *פ-יא 191.
- אודה עלי פשעי ואודה את שמך (411). *— תרביץ ז' 339.
84. אוהלו שני אחים בתוכחות מוכיחים. — פיוט לנשם. ס' א"ב (אות ח"ת חסרה). *מחקרים 167 [ש. שפיגל העירני שצ"ל אויילן].
85. און הטח לעם לבו ינהם. — ס' אני משה בר יעקב בן עזרה. *הדאר, גליון היובל לשנת ה'ט"ו (י"ד שבט תרצ"ו) עמ' 259.

86. **אוזן שומעת אתה כריתתה.**—ח'ה מן הקרובה אימת עם זו—סי' א'—י'. *ידיעות המכון ב' 258.
87. **אוחילה לקדוש בעד עם קדוש.**—סי' א'ב, סעדיה. *תקופתנו 462.
88. **אוי מי קשה כאב אשר לבניו היה כאויב.**—סליחה סי' א'ב, עמרם. [נהאיי גאון]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 14, עי' הערת המול שם עם' 49.
89. **אויבי אמילם ולניני אורח שלמא.**—סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חרש—ה' 6.
90. **אויבי עז עד אן בי ירדה.**—סי' אברהם חזק. *פ—יא 14.
91. **אולי בקרבת אהבים רחקו.**—(רמב"ע). *רמב"ע—דיואן 199.
92. **אולי ברקים בזבול ברקו.**—[מדרוס אבולעאפיא]. *ידיעות המכון 59.
93. **אום אשר נקרא שמם יהודים.**—ח'ה מן הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך—סי' א'ב. *פיוטי יניי 10.
94. **אמן אמונה למועצה אשר רחקה.**—פיוט סי' אברהם בן יצחק [נהאיי גאון חברו על שם האיש הזה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 54.
95. **אומן בשמעו עלה ומת בהר.**—ח"ו מן הקרובה: אומן שלא קם כמותו—סי' א'ב. *קובץ על יד, י"א 13.
96. **אומן מצורים אל חקתה בירח איתנים גוי שומר אומן.**—שבעתא למוסף ר"ה. חלקי השבעתא: (א) אומן מצורים—סי' א—ל (כל אות ב' פעמים וכל בית מתחיל ומסיים במלה אמת). (ב) מתי מלכות מעדינה ענייה תירש—סי' מ'—ע' (אות עיין חסרה. אבל הכי משובש כל כך עד שאי אפשר לומר בהחלט מה בנינו של החלק הזה). (ג) קול פוער פה היום לשומנינו—סי' פ'צ, פ'צ, צ'ק, צ'ק וכו'. (ד) אבד אשר תאדיף—סי' אא"ת, בב"ש וכו'. (ה) אל אחותם תשיבם בבית בחירתך—סי' אא"ת, בב"ש, וכו'. (ו) בחצוצרות ובקול שופר רון תרועה ישפר—בלי סי' ומסיים בג' ברכות האחרונות של השמנה עשרה. הערה: כנראה חסר כאן חלק אחד באמצע. *עדעלטן 7—10.
- אומן שלא קם כמותו (1861).—קרובה לשמחת תורה [קליר]. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מנן): אומן שלא קם כמותו—סי' א'—ל'; חתימה: החיים חי מעמך חיינו. ב. (מחיה): מתנת דת יום חתנתו—סי' מ'—ת'; חתימה: הארץ לקראת עניו סלסלה. ג. אילת אהבים בפז מכללה—סי' אלעזר חזק. ד. מי גבר בעולם קם כמשה—בלי סימן. ה. אמן שפך והפיל תחנון—סי' אלעזר (כל אות ב' פעמים). ו. אומן בשמעו עלה ומת בהר—סי' א'ב. ז. (סלוק): מי גבר יחיה ולא יראה מות. *קובץ על יד י"א 9—23.
97. **אומן שפך והפיל תחנון.**—ח'ה מן הקרובה: אומן שלא קם כמותו—סי' אלעזר (כל אות ב' פעמים). *קובץ על יד, י"א 12.

98. אומץ אבירים בוחק בוערים גאון גלגלים.—ח"ה מן קרובה לר"ה שהתחלתי בלתי נודעה—סי' א"ב. *עדעלמן 6.
99. אומץ דברות בזנחי טס מיני פרחי.—ח"ה (עשיריה) מן קרובה לר' ישועה החבר בירבי נתן, שראשה חסר והוא קינה על מות בנו יאשיהו—סי' א'—י', ישועה. *ידיעות המכון ג' 178.
100. אומץ חלק בחתולות בעשר ברכות מעולות . . . מריח גן עדן מברך היריח.—ח"ד וח"ה של הקרובה: איש תם בטוב אסמחה סי' א"ב. *ידיעות המכון ב' 225.
101. אומר אשר אדברה ואספרה.—ח"ו מקרובה שראשיתה חסרה—סי' א"ב. *וולאי 80.
- †אומר לה' מחסי ומצודתי ביום אקרא.—ע' אודה את ה' היום יום הששי.
102. אומרה לאל סלעי למה שכחתי בצלעי.—סי' אלב"ם. *מבחר—שירמן 24.
103. אופן לבנה עם גלגל חמה.—ח"ז מן קרובה לסדר ויעל משה (דברים ל"ד, א')—סי' א"ב [ניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 339.
104. אור היקר עטה נגידי כמעיל.—[שמריה בן אילהו האקריטי]. *מבחר—שירמן 168.
105. אור זרוח לצדיק ולישרי לב שמחה והרוחה.—*פ—יא 19.
106. אורה וישועה אושרה נושעה על ידי אסתר.—שריד מן קרובה לפורים. *גנזי שירה 52 (החלקים החסרים בספר נמצאו בכ"י אדלר 2924).
107. אורות ומאורות וככבים ומזלות אשר ביום הרביעי הכנת לתלות.—סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 62.
108. אורח אין למו כי המה משרתיך בארץ לא שוטטים.—חלק מקרובה—סי' אלב"ם. *גנזי שירה 84.
109. אורי חתום בגן עדן גנוזים בנאמן.—*פ—יא 133.
110. אות במועד גש דרישת הגיון.—חלק מן שבעתא לסכות שראשיתה בלתי נודעה—סי' א"ב [ניי?]. *ספר היוכל לקרוי 308.
111. אותה נפשי לבכורה ועללת בצירה.—סי' אברהם בן יצחק [הא"י] גאון חברו על שם האיש הזה. *ידיעות המכון ג' 55. ועוד פעם בעמוד 211.
112. אותו היום אשר יבא משיח בן דוד אל עם אשר נדחקו.—סלוק לט' באב [קליר?]. *גנזי שירה 28: חורב א' 29.
- או אמרתי הנה באתי (2087).—*דבר, גליון ט' באב תרצ"ו.

- 112A. **אז אמרתי הנה באתי לחלותך בעד עדתי.**—חלק מן קרובה ל'יה.
סי' א"ב [בנימין בר שמואל]. *אמת ליעקב 140.
113. **אז באין זרותי (?) מועל אף באפס כל פועל,**—זולת. סי' אני שלמה
בן גבירול (כל אות שש פעמים). *ירחון ע"ז 444.
114. **אז באמת סח לעם אשר בחר.**—ח"ז מקרובה שראשיתה חסר—סי' א"ב.
*וולאי 71.
115. **אז בבין בנרא ובקיו חקרה וחקר.**—סדר פתיחת שערים—סי' א"ב (כל אות
ד' פעמים) מגיע רק עד כ'. *גנוי שירה 75.
116. **אז בגאלך חלק נחצץ כילק ויבא עמלק בכתי גדודים בא לכתת
דודים.**—בית ראשון מפיוט זה לפורים נמצא בכ"י אדלר 2962. בגנוי שירה 57 הפיוט
מתחיל מן: ויבא עמלק בביתי גדודים. סי' א'—נ'. בכ"י אדלר הנ"ל נמצא סופו מאות
ס'—ת'. *גנוי שירה 57.
117. **אז בהיקרא באוני עניו מות.**—ח"ה מן הקרובה לדברים ל"א, יד—סי' א'—ד'
[יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 342.
118. **אז בשבעים שמות מפורש שם יי צבאות.**—חלק מקרובה לשבועות—
סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה 89.
119. **אז לך שלטון בכל חי.**—ח"ז מן הקרובה לסדר דברים ל"א, יד—סי' א'—ל'.
[יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 342.
120. **אז לקהל המוניך.** זולת—סי' א"ב (בשורות הראשונות של כל בית), מנחם
ברבי מרדכי הפרנס חוק אמן (בשורה השניה של כל בית). *ידיעות המכון ח"א 118.
121. **אז לראש תתנו ונמנו נתנה ראש.**—חטאנו ליוסי בן יוסי—סי' א"ב (מגיע רק
עד אות ע"ן). *חורב ב' 202.
122. **אז מאז בכל מפעל סקרתה.**—סי' א"ב (מגיע רק עד אות למ"ד). *גנוי
שירה 12.
123. **אז מכל קצב פלסתה שביעי.**—סי' א"ב (המול מוחסו לקליר, וצ"ע).
*חורב ב' 9.
124. **אז עד לא בראשית בן בקניני ראשית.**—יוצר לשבת—סי' א"ב (מן י' עד ת'
האותיות כפולות ואות ש"ן ד' פעמים) עם חרוז חזר סי' אלעזר [קליר?]. *גנוי
שירה 89; חורב א' 160.
125. **אזה דמי לבי תמיד כפי עצבי.**—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 232.

126. **אזור נא גבורות ועורר שוכני קברות.**—פיוט לנשם. סי' א"ב [קליר].
*מחקרים 170.
127. **אזיל מאוצר להשביעך.**—פיוט לנשם—סי' א'—ט'. *מחקרים 164.
128. **אזיל מעין דמעות כמו עין ואזעק מקין אשר הרג הבל.**—סי' אביגדר
בר חלפון. *תקופתנו 469 [נסמן שם בטעות אביגדר].
129. **אזכור מקדם פלאך אתה.**—*רשימה—שירמן 12.
- †**אזכיר חסדי ה' על כל טוב אשר גמלנו.**—עי' אומר ואשיר לה' היום
יום השבת.
130. **אזכיר תהלות ה' על כל הטוב אשר גמלתנו.**—זמר לחוה"מ פסח
ומבוארים בו רוב דיני הפסח. סי' א"ב (בחרוים א', ה', ט', וכו') את"בש (בחרוים
ב', ו', י', וכו') תשר"ק (בחרוים ג', ז', י"א, וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה
(בחרוים ד', ח', י"ב, וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 67.
131. **אזכרה אלהים ואהמיה באחו אותי ואת עמי אנשי רמיה.**—
סליחה סי' א"ב (מניע רק עד אמצע אות ז"ן). *ידיעות המכון ג' 175.
132. **אזמר ואשיר לה' היום יום השבת כי בו מכל מלאכתו שבת.**—
סי' אלב"ם (בחרוים א', ג', ה', וכו') נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוים ב',
ד', ו', וכו'). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 62.
133. **אזמר לאלהים לאלהים אל חי.**—*פ—יא 183.
134. **אזמר שירתא במשלם מסכתא אומן חברתא בהלולא רבא.**—
שיר בארמית לסיום מסכת קדושין מתלמידים בעיר וירונא בשנת תקנ"ה—סי' אני מנחם
נווירה. *תושבחתא שירתא דף ב' ע"ב.
135. **אזמרך ה' בכל לבב בסוד ישרים ועדה בחרת בנו מכל העמים**
על ארץ יסדה.—זמר לר"ח. סי' א"ב ואח"כ הפסוק ובראשי חדשיכם בסירונו
עם סי' תשר"ק, נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה. *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 66.
136. **אזעק אל ה' קולי תוך אמוני.**—סי' אבטליון. *פ—יא 24.
137. **אזעק למרחוק ועיני יבכיון.**—[משה בן יואב]. *מבחר—שירמן 239.
138. **אחד אלהינו ברוך אדוננו גדול אלהינו דגול אדוננו.**—סי' א"ב.
*פ—יא 194.
139. **אחד אתה ואין אחר.**—סלוק של הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך.
*פיוטי יניי 14.

140. **אחד אתה ומי ישיבך**—קרובה לסדר „שמע ישראל (דברים ו', ד') [יניי]“. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מנן): אחד אתה—סי' א'—ל'. כרוג: תשוקתו בנו. ב. (מחיה): מאד עזה כמות אהב (סי' מ'—ת'; חתימה: תמיד אקרא לך. ג. (משלש): יתחד שמך במיוחד שמך—סי' יניי. ד. (אתה קדוש—אל נא). 1. מה מבורך הוא מקור ישראל—בלי סי' וחותם ב„קדוש“. 2. איש תם בהאספו בניו אסף ושימע—סי' א'—יירד. ה. אום אשר נקרא שמם יהודים—סי' א'ב. ו. (ובכן ה' אחד): אין שני יש אחד—סי' א'ב. ז. סלוק: אחד אתה ואין אחר. *פיוטי יניי 5-15.

141. **אחד קדוש ישועתי און שוועתי**—חלק מן שמונה עשרה להושענא רבה—סי' א'ב (כל אות כפולה ב' פעמים, אותיות ו'—ר' חסרות). [קליד?] *ספר היובל לקרוים 309.

142. **אחווה דעי ונקיתי מפשע רב**—סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה' 4.

143. **אחותי כלה אז תחנון**—ח"ה מן הקרובה: אהבת נעורים מעולם במתחתנים—סי' אלעזר בירבי קליר. *גנוי שירה 48; הארץ, י"ג כסלו תרצ"ז.

144. **אחותי כלה בחופתה תשמח**—ח"ג מן הקרובה: אהבת נעורים מעולם במתחתנים—סי' אלעזר חזק. *גנוי שירה 47.

145. **אחי חסד אשר ידיו לארחים ולהלך בהתנדב כמו עב**—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 165.

146. **אחי מדע אשר העיר ישני מזמתו**—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 228.

147. **אחי שמעו קולי רעי האזינו לי**—סי' אפרים בן יואב ממוריא חזק. *מבחר—שירמן 200.

148. **אחלה בתחנוני אליך אדוני ולך אשא עיני ואכרע ואקודה**—סי' א'ב, יחיה בן סער. *תקופתנו 468.

149. **אחר מי יצא מלך קורא בהרים**—תשובה על פיוטו של רפאל משה אלבאן על הפרעושים [אבנר ישראל הצרפתי]. *שיר חדש—ה' 12.

150. **אחריך המשכתה קהלים במדבר הנהגתה במסלולים**—קרובה לסדר: אלה מסעי [יהודה]. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מנן): אחריך המשכתה—סי' א'—ל'; חתימה: במדבר לא חסרו טובו. ב. (מחיה): מחונתם ונסעתם גם קדוש בעדתם—סי' מ'—ת'; חתימה: יה תטעינו בתוך אדמתינו. ג. (משלש): יום ממים ומחיה לזרע כה יהיה—סי' יהודה. ד. עד מתי עמך תעו אשר אין להם ראש נתעו. בלי סימן. ה. אמנם שבע מסעות על יד רועה אמונה—סי' א'—ס'. ו. ארבעים ושתים מסעות סע עם אל—סי' א'—ע'. ז. (ובכן): אחובים באהבם דת מזהב ומכסף כנפי יונה נחפה בכסף (וזה כל מה שנשאר). *זולאי 32.

†**אידר עולמו בכוח תעצומו**—ע"י מי כמכה אל מושיע ונואל.

151. אידת קטורה בכף מעטיר (צ"ל מעתיר).—סי' א', ב', אלעזר, ג'-ת' [קליר].
*חורב א' 153; גנזי שירה 16.
152. איה אישי ואיה אשי.—ד' מלכנו דרבינו האיי. סי' א'-ח'. *ידיעות המכון ג' 44.
153. איום באיומתו שכינתו ישבה.—ח"ז מקרובה שראשיתה חסרה. סי' א"ב.
*זולאי 76.
154. איום בחר בשושנה ביום ראש השנה.—למעריב ר"ה. סי' א"ב. *גנזי שירה 90.
- איום תמים דעים מי לא יבעת להרעים (2682).—סי' א"ב. *אמת ליעקב 138.
155. איומה אין לה מקימה על אפיקי מבור תורה.—סי' אני בנימן.
*פ-יא 124.
156. איומתי בעת פתח סמדר חבצלת ושושן העמקים.—שיר בדרך וכוה
[כלב אפונדופולו]. *צינבערן-געשיכטע ח"ד 489.
157. איך אומלל חף ונקי.—ח"ז מן קרובה לר' ישועה החבר בירבי נתן שראשה חסר
והיא קינה על מות בנו יאשיהו. סי' א"ב (מניע רק עד אמצע אות ג'). *ידיעות המכון
ג' 183.
158. איך אחי מבלתי צבי או צביה.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות
המכון 89.
159. ... איך זמתי (ועמתי?) בכפלים זכרה ירושלם.—קינה לט' באב-
סי' ז'-ל' (כפול). *גנזי שירה 30.
160. איך יעמד לבי ואמצא על תבל ימותי אחריו נפש.—[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 191.
161. איך נאסף דודי איך ערבה רנה.—[משה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 376.
162. איכה יחי לבי בנודו ממך.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על
יד, י"א 86.
163. איכה ישבה בדד גברת ממלכות.—קינה [יוסף בן גוריון]. *מבחר-
שירמן 14 יוסיפון-מנטובה (עפ"י הוצאת גינצבורג-כהנא) עמ' תקל"ב.
164. איכה יתאפק איש גלו גיליו.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 129.
165. איכה תמותה תאמרו הוללות.—קינה על איש בשם מבורך [אלעזר הבבלי].
*מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 301 (מביא בתים מפורים); דיואן ר"א הבבלי 320.
- איככה אוכל פנים להרים (2927).—סי' א"ב, יוסף בר שמואל. *אמת ליעקב 132.

166. **אֵילַת אֱהָבִים בְּפִז מַכְלֵלָה.**—ח"ג מן הקרובה: אומן שלא קם כמותו. סי' אלעזר חזק [קליר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 10.
167. **אֵימַת עַם זֶז עַת יִס גִּזוּ.**—קרובה לסדר וירא בלק (במדבר כ"ב, ב'). חלקי הקרובה: א. (מגן): אֵימַת עַם וז-סי' א'-ל'; חתימה: אַנְלֵהִים יִחוּנְנוּ. ב. (מחיה): מַחְנוֹת אִישׁ צוּרִים-ס' מ'-ת'; חתימה: י"י אֶזְרָא עֵז. ג. (משלש): יְבוּשׁוּ עִמִּים יִחְפְּרוּ לְאוֹמִים-ס' יִי. ד. נִפְשָׁנוּ מִלְטָתָה כַּצְפּוֹר -בְּלִי סִמֵּן. ה. אוֹזֵן שׁוֹמֵעַת אֶתָּה כְּרִיתָה-ס' א'-י'. ו. וִירָא אוֹהֲלֵי מְשׁוּלֵי בִבְת עֵין-ס' א"ב. ז. וִירָא אֱהָבִים וַיֵּאמֶל וַאֲבָה לְאַרְרֵם-ס' א"ב (מְרֻבֵּעַ). ח. אִם אֶהְבַּתָּה מִי יִשְׁנֵא-ס' א"ב. ט. הַצּוֹפֶה מֶה עֵתִיד וְהַבּוֹטָח מֶה לְהִיּוֹת. *ידיעות המכון ב' 255-263.
- אין די לחילי (3002).—*ידיעות המכון ב' 166.
168. **אֵין הַגְדוּלָּה בַּצִּיץ וּבִרְבִּיד וּלְבוֹשׁ עֲדָנִים.**—שיר תהלה לנשיא בלתי ידוע. *ירחון ע"ו 337.
169. **אֵין כְּבִרְיָאוֹת עוֹשֵׁר וְאֵין כִּיחוּדִים אוֹשֵׁר.**—*לעווי-רשימה 103.
170. **אֵין לָנוּ לֹא אֶרֶץ גְּזִירָה [לְשַׁעִיר] לֹא אִישׁ עֵתִי לְשִׁלּוֹחַ.**—סי' א"ב (כפול) (מגיע רק עד אות פ"א הראשונה). *ערעלמן 28.
171. **אֵין עִמָּךְ לְעוֹזֵר תְּהִי יָדְךָ לְעֶזְרָנִי.**—סליחה-ס' א"ב, האיי [נאון]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 19.
172. **אֵין שְׁנֵי יֵשׁ אֶחָד.**—ח"ו מן הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך. סי' א"ב. *פיוטי יניי 12.
173. **אִישׁ חֲכָם בְּלֹא זָהָב כְּמוֹ אִשׁ בְּלֹא לֶהָב.**—*לעווי-רשימה 104.
- אִישׁ לֵיל חוֹרֵף תִּישֵׁן (3154).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 499.
174. **אִישׁ מִצָּרִי הַצִּילָנוּ כֵּן מִדְּלָה.**—*פ"א י"א 19.
175. **אִישׁ מֹשֶׁה לְמָרוֹם עָלָה לְהוֹרִיד עֵז דֵּת מַעוּלָּה.**—סי' אברהם בר שמואל חזק ואמץ. *פ-יא 121.
176. **אִישׁ צָר וְאוֹיֵב אֵיבַת הוֹרוֹ גִּילָה.**—פיוט לפורים-ס' א"ב (מגיע רק עד יו"ד). *נגזי שירה 54.
177. **אִישׁ תָּם בְּהַאֲסָפוֹ בְּנִין.**—ח"ד (2) מן הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך. סי' א'-י'. *פיוטי יניי 9.
178. **אִישׁ תָּם בְּטוֹב אֲסַמְתָּה בִּרְכוֹת עָלָיו שְׁמַתָּה.**—קרובה לבראשית כ"ז, כ"ח [שמעון הכהן בירבי מנס]. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מגן): אִישׁ תָּם-ס' א'-ל'; חתימה: לֵילָה וַיּוֹם לָךְ מְבִיעִים וְזָמַר לָךְ. ב. (מחיה): מִנֵּת שֹׁפֵר חֲבָלִים-ס' מ'-ת'. חתימה: רִנְלִינוּ תַעֲמִיד בְּמִשּׁוֹר. ג. (משלש): שׁוֹשְׁנַת עִמָּךְ תִּפְרַח-ס' שְׁמַעוֹן הַכֹּהֵן יַחִי.

- ד. אומץ חקק בחתולות—סי' א'—ל'. ה. מריח גן עדן מברך הריח—סי' מ'—ת'. ו. מאנד ברכות הכלולות הוד—סי' א'ב. ז. 'ובכן מטל השמים': אישרתה כישרון גואל—סי' א'ב. ח. (סלוק): ובכן לעולם הטל. *ידיעות המכון ב' 223—230.
179. אישים אשר גאו בים נצחם סורו ואל תשגו במוזרה.—[נצחק בן אברהם עזיאל]. *מזרח ומערב ה' 369.
180. אישים בלי שם על זמנם רעמו.—[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזקת ליהודה 70.
181. אישיר כלי השיר ואכשיר ניב.—[משה בן יואב]. *מבחר—שירמן 237.
182. אישרתה כישרון גואל.—ח'ז' מן הקרובה: איש תם בטוב אסמתה—סי' א'ב. *ידיעות המכון ב' 228.
- אכלונו הממונו צרים אשר בכל עת אותנו מצירים (2363).—סי' משה בר יעקב חזק. *ההד שנה י' גליון ג' עמ' כ"ח—כ"ט.
- אכן אתה אל מסתתר נסתר ונעלם מכל עין (3274).—*אמת ליעקב 145.
183. אכן סר מר המות נמתק מדבש היטב.—סליחה—סי' א'ב. האיי [גאון] *ידיעות המכון ג' 17.
184. אל אבי ארוממנהו אל אלה הוא.—סי' אברהם. *פ—יא 10.
185. אל אדיר שם בכ יחסון.—סי' אני שמו[נאל?]. *פ—יא 173.
186. אל אומן חי דיר לי בנה.—*פ—יא 214.
187. אל אחד ושני אין לו אספר מקצת הילולו.—ח'ז' (סידרה) מן קרובה לר' ישועה החבר בירבי נתן שראשה חסר והיא קינה על מות בנו יאשיהו. סי' א'ב. *ידיעות המכון ג' 180.
188. אל אחד עוטה כמעטה שריין.—סי' א'ב. *גנוי שירה 106.
- אל אחוזתם תשיכם.—ח'ה מן השבעתא: 'אומן מצורים אל חקתה'.
189. אל איום המצא למשחריך בשיחה.—ליוכ"פ—סי' א'—ל'. *גנוי שירה 114.
190. אל אל מאד נשגב יתרומם ויתברך ויתנשא.—שיר בסוף ספר הוהר (כ"י) [משה בן ירמיה]. *לעוו—רשימה 92.
191. אל אלהי האלהים ואדוני האדונים.—סי' א'ב. *כפא—כ"י 109.
192. אל אלוקי הרוחות לכל בשר אשר בידך נפש כל חי. . . תיקר נא בעיניך נפש עבדך. . .—תפלה פרטית לכל חיל יהודי שתקנה הרב אנגלו סאצירדוטי 'מפני שלא לכל יהודי איטלקי היה סדור תפלה'. *הארץ, תל אביב שנה י"ח גליון 4762 (יום א' י"ב אדר ב' תרצ"ה). עמ' 4.

193. אל אלהי נפשי אנהל.—סי' א"ב—משה קטן (כל אות ג' פעמים). [רמב"ע].
*הדאר, גליון היובל לשנת ה'ט"ו (י"ד שבט, תרצ"ו) עמ' 260.
194. אל אלהים דברתי אשים וטוב הגיוני.—סי' אנטגלי, א"ב, בעיר אודרונט
חזק. *ידיעות המכון ח"א 121.
195. אל אלהים יושב בשמי מרומים.—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 157.
196. אל אלהים לך אקרא אודה שמך ואזמרה.—סי' אברם. *פ-יא 55.
197. אל אלהים לך רוהים לפני היכל לפני.—סי' אני יוסף ברבי ששת [מפני
הסי' צריך לנסח, יום' בשורה ג' ובשורה י"ד, תחלצם'. *ידיעות המכון ב' 184.
198. אל אלהים עושה פלא עמך הוצא מכלא.—סי' אהרן. *פ-יא 204.
199. אל אלי אב הרחמן תן לגלותי דירמאן.—*פ-יא 158.
200. אל אמונה כונן שמים בתבונה.—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 129.
201. אל אמיץ אומר ועושה אל בוחן סרעפי לב ומנסה.—סי' א"ב.
*כפא-כ"י 114.
202. אל ארוממך אודה שמך תוך עמך.—סי' אבטליון. *פ-יא 8.
203. אל בים קנה נעץ בנה אדום לתת היקום.—סי' אבטליון. *פ-יא 113.
204. אל בן דוד משיחנו תתן לעמך אלהינו ימתן.—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 76.
205. אל בנה ביר עד אין חקר.—סי' אהרן. *פ-יא 3.
206. אל גדול דר על שחקים מדנם (?) וחיכו ממתיקים.—סי' אמצה (?).
*פ-יא 72.
207. אל גינת אגוז ירדתי לראות פני דוד.—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 99.
208. אל דר ברום כונן שבילי.—סי' יצחק. *פ-יא 11.
209. אל הלקח פאר הדור והלו הוא אשר אמרנו נחיה בצלו.—קינה
על עמור אביטבול-סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 61.
210. אל המון עמים יבואני לפר ברית אח לא יחתני.—[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 244.
- אל הסופר תן מנוח רבו ציריו מני ארבה (931).—*שאלות שאול הכהן ד"ו 1574, 26.
211. אל הרוואה יעלה תעלה אגוד לה כל מצפוניה.—[סעדיה לונוג].
*זאת ליהודה 66.

212. אל השב לעדתך תוך עיר ציון בתפארה. —פ* יא 201.
213. אל חי יעלה חנון מלך אדיר ונורא. —פ* יא 6.
214. אל חי יקרא המקרה במים עליות. —סי' אברהם [ראב"ע]. *כ"י אדלר 2872. הערה: חלק ממנו בהתחלה: „רוח אל תנחם" מובא בהוספות באות רי"ש סי' 29*.
215. אל חי לבי נמס בקרבי בעלות על לבבי. —סי' אברוך. *פ-יא 131 ועוד פעם בעמ' 199.
216. אל חי לך נפשי צמאה. —סי' אני יצחק סלמה. *רשימה-שירמן 16.
217. אל חי מי כמוך חסין יה יה דוד. —סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 125.
218. אל יד חותם תכנית יובא מכתבי בשמחות וגיל. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 264.
219. אל יוצר אל [צ"ל: כל] הנשמה שוכן ברום השמימה. —סי' אני משה. *פ-יא 199.
- †אל יורדי הים אני אקרא. —[רמב"ע-דיואן 155] עי' ליורדי הים.
220. אל יושב בסתר עליון הנעלם מכל רעיון. —סי' דוד. *פ-יא 126.
221. אל יחירי בלי שני אליך תלויה עיני. —סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 9.
222. אל יציב היכלו על מכונו. —*רשימה-שירמן 17.
223. אל ישלח לנו ידידו עני ורוכב על פרדו. —פ* יא 131.
224. אל לבי פתח בתורתך ה' תחכמני. —תפלה שנהגו בה מלמדי תינוקות מימי קדם להתפלל בה עם הילדים קודם הלימוד. —סי' א"ב. *כתר תורה הנקרא תאג ח"ג [ירושלים תרנ"ט] מעבר לשער; מקורות לתולדות החנוך ח"ג 116.
225. אל מול פני אל אראה שלש פעמים בשנה. —שיר לשלש רגלים. *לעוו-רשימה 102 (רק ב' חרחים הראשונים).
226. אל מי קרא דבר בו כוכבים. —סי' יוסף. *פ-יא 120.
227. אל מלא רחמים שוכן במרומים. —הזכרה להרנוי כמה קהלות בפולין בשנת תש"ז. *מאסף ח"א עמ' 15 סי' ט'.
228. אל מלא רחמים שוכן במרומים. —הזכרה לקדושים שנהרגו בק"ק קראקא בכ"ד חשון שנת תכ"ד. *מאסף ח"א עמ' 15 סי' י'.
229. אל מלא רחמים שוכן מרומים. —הזכרה להקדוש ר' מתתיהו שנהרג ב"ד כסלו שנת תכ"ד. *מאסף ח"א עמ' 15 סי' י"א.

230. אל מלא רחמים שוכן מרומים המציא מנוחה נכונה תחת כנפי השכינה לשמותיהם של הרוגי ק"ק פאדערפיש . . . —הזכרה לקדושי ת"ח. *מאסף ח'א עמ' 10 ס' ד'.
231. אל מסתתר מאוד נעלה תן לתהילה עיר ההוללה. —פ*—יא 67.
232. אל מצות אל הוי זריו עשה אותן כהלכתן. —שיר לסכה. *לעווי—רשימה 102.
233. אל נא אב אשר הנהיג לשונו בנא. —ס' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 111.
234. אל נאמן יה רציני אורח חיים תודיעני. —ס' אליהו בר עמרם חזק. תהלות לאל 9.
235. אל נגדי חנה לנגדי דוד. —ס' אברהם. *פ—יא 119.
236. אל נורא עלילה שוכן שמי זבולה הפליא נא מחילה. —לנעילה—ס' אהרן בר ישועה חזק. *גנוי שירה 113.
237. אל נעלם בורא עולם השמים וחילם. —ס' יעקב. *פ—יא 112.
238. אל נערץ בקדושה בנה בית אל המשושה. —פ*—יא 73.
239. אל עיר קדש כמה בשרי כלה שאירי. —ס' אני הדל רפאל משה אלבאז חזק אמן. *שיר חדש—ה' 14.
240. אל על כבודו מה נעלה על כל גדלה ומעלה. —גאלה—ס' מאיר הלוי [אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 75.
241. אל על כל אלים מרים שפלים. —ס' אני שלמה מבורך *רשימה—שירמן 20.
242. אל עליון אדיר בשמי ערץ. —מעמדות ליוכ"פ—ס' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 106.
243. אל צוית פקודך במאוד מאוד. —פ*—יא 6.
244. אל קדוש יושב תהלות נורא עלילות. —ס' אבטליון. *פ—יא 29.
245. אל קרב נא קץ גאולה. —ס' אברהם. *פ—יא 126.
246. אל רב עוצמה ביזי אונוטמה. —עברית ואיספניולית. *פ—יא 174.
247. אל שוכן שחקים ביטה משחקים. —חלק מקרובה ליוכ"פ—ס' א"ב. *גנוי שירה 16; חורב ח'א 153.
248. אל שלח בן איש אפרתי שולטני בעמים תך. —ס' אבטליון. *פ—יא 30.
249. אל תדאגה איש גם תלך כמו שובב. —כ"ה לחי 2.

250. אל תהיה בז אל כל אדם אף כי בשנים הוא נער.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 54.
251. אל תהיה כישנים ביום.—[מנחם די לונאנו.] *שתי ידות 149.
252. אל תהיה עצל ודע לך כי עצלות אנוש סבה לדלותו.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 79.
253. אל תוסף להוכיחני ושמע נא בקולי.—[מדרוס אבואלעאפיה.] *יריעות המכון 65.
254. אל תחמלו על טוב זבוד זבוד רע.—[מנחם די לונאנו.] *שתי ידות 149.
255. אל תקצוף אדון עולמים ואל לעד תזכור עון בנים רחומים.—סי' א'—מ'. *גנוי שירה 111.
256. אל תשכח לנצח עם נחלתיך.—סי' אנ... לתבא [אני לוי אלתבאן?]. *רשימה—שירמן 21.
257. אלבש שמחות וגילים אף יאחזוני חבלים.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר—שירמן 230.
- אלה וכחש ורצח וכחש (*1143).—ד"ח של האקדמיה ח"ה 88 [מגיע רק עד אות ק' של הא"ב].
258. אלוה חי ומבין כל צפונות.—פתיחה לב' דר"ה [אליקים]. *כפא—כ"י 10.
259. אלוה נורא הוד גדלתה מאד מי אל כמוך.—פיוט ליוכ"פ—סי' א"ב [מגיע רק עד אות וי"ו]. *עדעלמן 14.
260. אלהי אבטח בו צור מצודתי.—סי' רפאל [משה אלבאו]. *שיר חדש—ה' 7.
261. אלהי אקרא אל גדול גבור ונורא.—תפלת הדרך—סי' שם של כ"ב [אנקת מפסת מפספ סימד יונסימ], יעקב נפתלי בן מה"רר יהודה ז"ל, א"ב. *עובר אורח 164.
- אלהי ארוממך בלב נלאה (*1167).—*תרביץ ז' 342.
262. אלהי בגבורה נאזר קראתיך מן המצר.—סי' אהרן אלחדיף חוק. *מפי אהרן (מעבר לשער).
263. אלהי ישועתנו שנאל את אבותנו הוא ינאלנו.—סי' אני מאיר חוק. *פ—יא 68.
- אלהי כוננה עבדך לעבדך (*1193).—*חורב ג' 8.

264. אלהי לך אחפלל על ציון יופי מכלל. —סי' אבר[ם]. *פ-יא 152.
- †אלהי צורי בי בעזרי אתה תאיר. —עי' מי האיש החפץ לראות אותם תמונת כל דברי חכמים.
265. אלהי שמע נא לקול עבדך עשה לי למענן כפי חסדך. —סי' אברהם [ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ ה' 70; ואולי הוא המובא באוה"ש אות אל"ף סי' 4655.
266. אלהיך יזכך וכל נדר בתדורה. —שיר בראש מכתב שנשלח לר' יהודה אלוף [ר' האי גאון]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 126-132; ידיעות המכון ג' 33.
267. אלהים ברוב חסדך יחד שמך בפי מיחדך. —[משה מבורך]. *כפא-כ"י 80.
268. אלהים ה' חילי אתה תומיך גורלי. —סי' אליהו חזק. *פ-יא 126.
269. אלהים אלפתה סגולת שבטיך. —יוצר-סי' אני שלמה בן יהודה גבירול חזק (וכל אות ג' פעמים) ועוד בית חזק סי' שלמה בא אחר הבית השלישי. *ירחון ע"ז 441.
270. אלהים זנחתנו פרצתנו אנפת תשובב לנו. —סי' שלמה [בן משה בן יקותיאל מן האדמים]. *מבחר-שירמן 105.
271. אלהים חי מאד נשגב ונפלא. —שיר בראש פירוש לס' השם של הראב"ע (כ"י) סי' שבתי כהן [בן מלכיאלי]. *צינבערג-נעשיכטע ח"ד 479.
272. אלהים חסדיך מהרה יבאוני. —[ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ-ה' 69.
- †אלהים יחוננו. —עי' אימת עם זו.
273. אלהים ישגיח ממכון שבתו. —סי' אברם [ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ-ה' 72.
274. אלהים לחתן תנה חניך תחדהו בשמחה את פניך. —סי' יהודה [אבן גיאת]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 181 (רק ראשיתו), 193-194 (בשלמותו).
- †אלהינו כך בטחו אבותינו. —עי' ה' שמע נא את קולנו חוסה וגם רחם עלינו אלהינו כך וכו'.
275. או"א אור טל תאהל ארקה איביה להאביב. —חפלת טל-סי' א"ב (וכל אות שש פעמים) —[קליר?]. *עדעלמן 1.
276. או"א אנחנו ר . . . בטנף גוף. —חלק מודוי ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב. *עדעלמן 12.
277. או"א ממנו רחם מנחם אבד כל חזון ויד. —סליחה על הקדושים משה ור' יהודה בני יקותיאל מנומבין שנהרנו בשנת שנו'. סי' מאנש [מנחם מאנש בן יצחק חיות] בבית הראשון, ובכל בית שלאחריו סי' משה או יהודה. *סליחה שנתקה על הנס . . . לובלין שנו' 4 דפים פוליו עם פירוש בקצרה. כל זה מובא במאסף 'עלים' לדוד פרענקיל חוברת ג' עמ' 78-80. הערה: אריה יהודה ליב ליפשיץ שם שנה שניה עמ' 23-24.

278. או"א ממעמקים אקרא לעורר תמרורים בנהימה. — סליחה על הקדושים הנ"ל ס' משה יהודה מיוסף חזק ניוסף הלוי ספרא דבי דינא דפונא. *שבלים בודדות 171—175. עי' ג"כ, 'עלים' לדוד פרענקיל חוברת ג' עמ' 78.
279. או"א תסלח תעובו. . . . וא . . . נו תשכיח שימץ שיקצינו. — חלק מודוי ליוכ"פ—ס' 'חשד'ק (כל אות ג' פעמים). *עדעלמן 12.
- אילו פינו מלא שירה כים להודות לשמך אל חי וקיים (*1273). — ידיעות המכון ג' 173.
280. אלון עלי בניס אשר אין בס אמן. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 202.
281. אלי אלהים השליט בשמים ובארץ. — תפלה קודם הפלת הנורל נרב צמח נאון בר רב אחאי גאון. *נורל העשירות 4.
282. אלי הבן הולך בתמים שלומותיו כמו מימי גשמים. — ס' 'אני משה בן שמואל הצפח. *מאנן—טעקסט ח"ב 249.
283. אלי וילון יאמירון גדלו. — פומון לקדושת מוסף—ס' 'א'—ל'. [מיוחס לרשב"ג]. *פיוטים ספרדיים 7.
284. אלי ונהי קינים והגא והי בת גלים צהלי קולך. — ס' 'א'—כ'. ת'. *גנוי שירה 30.
285. אלי ישיב הכלו על מכונו בשלומי אין דורש. — *פ—יא 157.
286. אלי נא הבט את אויבי אתה ישודם. — ס' 'אבין. *פ—יא 14.
287. אלי עזרי אברך אשר לימד דרך לעם חמוקי ירך. — הלכות שחיטה בחרחים. ס' 'אליעזר נבר נתן—הרא"ב. *ספר היובל לר' שמעון שקא"פ 82.
288. אלי צור ישועתי הבט נא לצרתי. — *פ—יא 76.
289. אליך ה' אקרא, חנון, תצילני מכל צרה, חנון. — *פ—יא 54.
290. אליך ה' אקרא מלך אדיר ונורא אל אל יעננו. — ס' 'יעקב חזק. *פ—יא 106.
291. אליך נפשי אשא אלוה נושא ונישא. — פיוט ליו"כ—ס' 'א"ב (מנוע רק עד אות נ"מ'ל). *עדעלמן 14.
292. אליך נשאתי את עיני היושב בשמים על חסדך ואמתך בכפלים. — שיר בשבח הספר [יצחק המחוקק]. *תורה עם רש"י רמב"ן ור"י אבוהב קראקא 1587, דף ש"ח ע"ב.
293. אליכם אישים הלומי זמן דברתי אישים. — ס' 'אני רפאל משה אלבאז. *שיר חדש—ה' 16.

294. **אלמדה אורחות יושר בדרך אשר תלכו באושר.**—פיוט לערביח (של יוהכ"פ) סי' א"ב. *עדעלמן 10.
295. **אלפתה לעם חשוקיך במוצא שפתם.**—קרובה לסדר: וידבר משה אל ראשי המטות. [יהודה]. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מגן): אלפתה לעם חשוקיך—סי' א'—ל'; חתימה: סלה... תרגל לשונינו. ב. (מחיה): מוסר הנחיל לשבטים—סי' מ'—ת'; חתימה: תשלם טובה לרפה. ג. (משלש): יפה שתיקה ודמימות פה—סי' יהודה. ד. עד מתי פוזרנו סחי ומאוס היינו כולנו—בלי סימן. ה. אמנם בשתים נמשלה עדת קהלו—סי' א'—ל. ו. אדם אם יהיה פרוץ ושפתיו חטות—סי' א'—י. ז. אמרת בחכמה עיוז ונבור טוב ארך אפים מנבור—סי' א"ב. *זולאי 28.
296. **אם אהבתה מי ישניא.**—ח"ז 21 מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו—סי' א"ב. *ידיעות המכון ב' 262.
297. **אם אומר לך גיסי חלקי ומנת כוסי.**—[שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *תרביץ ח' 65.
298. **אם אכתבה שירה ואעירה.**—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר—שירמן 231.
299. **אם ארדפה להלך על תבל.**—סי' לשיר: „כשרש עץ” [רשב"ג]. *מנחה לדוד 186.
300. **אם אש יגונים להטה נפשי.**—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 44.
301. **אם בניך חטאו ותשלחם ביד גואל.**—סי' א"ב. בנימן בר אברהם הרופא. *רשימה—שירמן 27.
302. **אם הוא בענותו יסתיר חמודותיו.**—שיר תהלה לנשיא בלתי ידוע. *ירחון ע"ז 337.
303. **אם הוד והדר עטרך יוצרך.**—[סעדיה לונגו]. *חאת ליהודה 64.
304. **אם העליתם כנשרים אבר.**—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר—שירמן 231.
305. **אם התהלה שפלה כואבה הוא לה מנשא.**—שיר תהלה לנשיא בלתי ידוע. *ירחון ע"ז 336.
306. **אם חזקה מני חכמת בנו עזרא.**—שיר בראש פירושו לס' יסוד מורא—סי' אני מרכי כומטיו. *בערנהיימער—רשימת כ"י אמברוניאנא 121 (רק חלק).
307. **אם חטא על לילה אם ארך.**—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 68.
308. **אם חשקך בלחיי שם חח.**—[שדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 34.

309. **אם יעלה על לב איש לשאול למי הוא זה.**—שיר על אדות ס' ארבעה קנינים [יהודה בן שלמה קפנטון]. *לעווי-רשימה 114.
310. **אם יעלה על עש רדה משם.**—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 50.
311. **אם יעשה רשע דבר צדק.**—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
312. **אם יש לך צורך עבור מעברה.**—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
313. **אם ישמעו לי שבטי חיילים בני שלשה המעולים.**—קרובה לסדר אם בחקותי. [יהודה]. חלקי הקרובה: א. (מנן): אם ישמעו לי—סי' א'—ל': חתימה: למדיני תורתך גואלי. ב. (מחיה): מוכיחים יונעם להם במה נעים ומה טוב—סי' מ'—ת'; חתימה: יכולה ישנה בה. ג. (משלש): ישביעך יכול שמיה ויעשה רצונך בכל עת ועונה—סי' יהודה. ד. עד מתי כל צר ואויב קרב עורך—בלי סימן. *זולאי 72.
- אם כח אנוש ככה ארי ונמר (5366).—*ההד שנה י"א גליון ו' (תשרי תרצ"ו) עמ' 6.
314. **אם לא ידעתם עד כה כי לא לאדם דרכו שיתו לבכם לזמן וראו צפוני חשכו.**—[דון וידאל כנבנשת]. *אמתאל אל דאודייה ח"ג עמ' 16.
315. **אם לא תבחר המותרות תמיד תשמח גם לא תבוש.**—מכתם. *כתאב ורוד ח"ב 15. כה לחי 3.
316. **אם לשנת שד ישאל שאל בה שבת לצדק גואל.**—[נאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 47.
317. **אם מן הדין נזכה ליטול חלקנו.**—[שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *תרביץ ח' 63.
318. **אם נפקדה בראש כל מועדי זמנים.**—לר"ה. סי' א'—ד'. *גנוי שירה 13.
319. **אם פי צדק שנא כפר לי כאלו לא היה.**—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 164; 202 (מנסח בטעות: אם צדק).
320. **אם תחפוץ לידע גמר מחזור זמן אנה.**—חתימת הספר. *אסב (בדף שאחרי דף שצ"ב. דף זה ועוד דף בלתי נסמן במספר חסרים בכמה טופסים וזה גרם להשמטת הקולופן הזה באוצר השירה כרך א').
321. **אם תפקוד על עמך לדקדק עד מציון.**—סי' א"ב [אותיות ע'—ש' חסרות בכ"י]. *גנוי שירה 95. הערה: תרביץ שנה ו' עמ' 88 הוספה.
322. **אם תראה אח נלכד בפת מהר המצא אליו פדיוס.**—מכתם מתוך מקור בשם 'מקדמי ארץ'. *כתאב ורוד ח"ב 12.

323. **אם תשאל על מחזה סודות נבואה או חלום.**—שיר כראש ס' ארון העדות לר' יהודה בר יוסף ברסאני (כ"י). *בערנהיימר-רשימה כ"י אמברוויאנא 148; המזכיר י"ב 105.
324. **אמאס אני עפרות וחברת יעלות החן.**—[משה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 378; מבחר-שירמן 236.
325. **אמאס אתעב מעדה גאון.**—[שמואל אקרייולטי]. *חרביץ ח' 67.
326. **אמוני סוכה ונסוכך.**—שריד מפיזט לסכות. *עדעלמן 32.
- אמור לאיש אשר יקוץ (*1524).—*חורב ג' עמ' 14.
327. **אמור לאלהינו נורא ואדיר.**—ס' אני שלמה מבורך הסופר חזק. *רשימה-שירמן 28.
328. **אמן אמן שם נורא אל אדיר מלך שלם הוא יביאנו לעיר שלם.**—*פ-יא 132.
329. **אמנם אנחמך ואם רב אבלך.**—[נר'א הבבלי]. *דיואן ר'א הבבלי 101.
- אמנם אשמנו עצמו מספר (5748).—הבתים המכילים אותיות כ'-ח' נדפסו ע"י יוסף מרקס בחורב ב' 205–207.
330. **אמנם בשתים נמשלה עדת קהלו.**—ח"ה מן הקרובה: אלפתה לעם חשוך-סי' א'-ל' (אות י"ד חסרה). *זולאי 30.
- אמן כן יצר מוכן בנו (5763).—ה' יוסף יעקב'ס בספרו The Jews of Angevin England עמ' 109–111 מביא חרגום אנגלי מאת ישראל זנוויל ומוסיף שני בתים מכ"י אוקספורד שסימנם יום טוב, ומה מחליט שמחבר פיוט זה הוא ר' יו"ט מיונני.
331. **אמנם עצת האל לבד תקום.**—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *יריעות המכון ב' 22.
332. **אמנם שבע מסעות על יד רועה אמונה.**—ח"ה מן הקרובה: אחריו המשכחה קהלים-סי' א'-ס'. *זולאי 34.
333. **אמנם שלוש שירות חרותות ורמוזות.**—ח"ה מן הקרובה שראשיתה חסרה. סי' א'-ל'. *זולאי 70.
334. **אמצץ ביום זה אזכירה.**—פיוט ליוכ"פ-סי' אלעזר ב' וכל אות ג' פעמים ונראה שסופו חסר) עם חרוז חזר-סי' אלעזר (ב' פעמים) [קליר?]. *חורב א' 155; גנוי שירה 18.
335. **אמצתה שחקים כראי חזקים אין מלבדך.**—ליוכ"פ-סי' א'ב (מגיע רק עד אות וי"ו). *ייוזי שירה 74.

336. אמר נא לכל הגוים ושאל לכל הארצות. —סליחה-סי' א"ב, האיי [נאון].
*ידיעות המכון ג' 21.
337. אמרה סגלה נוחלה איה משימי נחלה. —סי' אברהם בן יצחק [האיי נאון
חברו על שם אברהם בן יצחק החזן]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 51.
338. אמרו לאחותיכם רוחמה אושיע לא בחרב ובחנית. —סי' רפאל
[משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 8.
339. אמרו לגוי נבל מתעתע אשר לעשות כמעשה דת אלהים דמו. —
[ראב"ע ?]. *הרב"ץ-ה' 68.
340. אמרו לחורפנו בזמן לחמנו. —[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון
ב' 23; כתאב ורוד ח"ב 19.
341. אמרו למי חבק שערו לחיו. —[רשב"ג?]. *לקט שירים 22.
342. אמרו לשר שלום עלה ושלם וחיה עלי אף צר עדי עולם. —
זה כל מה שמובא משיר תהלה לשר שלום אלרייס אבי אלעלא בן אלנשאר [אלעזר
הבבלי]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 301; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 319.
343. אמרו פרח והוציא פרח מטהו לפני כל קונה. —סי' אברהם בן [האיי
נאון]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 56.
344. אמרות אל ותפילותיו ספרו נא בקדושתו. —*פ-יא 176.
345. אמרי שפר עם צחצחות קח מספר הקדחות. —התחלת ספר הקדחות
ליצחק ישראלי. *בערנהיימר-רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 129 (רק ג' חרוזים).
346. אמרר על עונותי ואפלח כליותי. —סי' משה בן צור. *צלצלי שמע 46.
347. אמרת בחכמה עיוזו וגבור. —ח"ז מן הקרובה: אלפתה לעם חשוך-סי' א"ב.
*זולאי 32.
348. אמרתי אספרה מעשה רב ונורא. —על מות ר' יהודה שושנה על קדוש השם.
סי' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 8.
349. אמת יהגה חכי ולא שקר נסכי. —[יעקב טרפון]. *מנחה לדוד 211.
350. אמת כי לזמן מלות ברקים לו וגם קולות. —שיר בתוך מחברת התשיעית
של "ספר המוסר" לזכריה אלצאהרי. *ידיעות המכון ג' 197.
351. אמת תבל כחותם צר לפני. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 211.
352. אנא אדון עולם אשר אמר אחרון אני ואני ראשון. —סי' אני אחישוב
[הרופא מפלירמן]. *ידיעות המכון ח"א 141-142; מבחר-שירמן 126.

353. **אנא ה' אלהי ישראל מלך חנון ורחום אל יחר אפך בנו.**—[ריא'ס].
*צדוק הדין 6.
354. **אנא ה' הושיענה משיחנו שלח נא.**—סי' אני מנחם חוק. *פ-יא 186.
355. **אנא אל בוראי רפה את צירי.**—*פ-יא 26.
356. **אנא אל הנשא בוחר באב נוסה.**—סי' א"ב סעיד בן מרחב חוק.
*תקופתנו 460.
357. **אנא דודי אמרתי חונני ה' כל מעני.**—סי' רפאל [משה אלכאז]. *שיר
חדש ה' 56.
358. **אנא הבט עמך כלנו אם אנפת תשובב לנו.**—סי' א"ב (כפול) יחיאל בר
אברהם חוק [בן יואב]. *מבחר-שירמן 52.
359. **אנא חמול עלי צורי ומשגבי.**—*לעווי-רשימה 26.
360. **אנבל את נבלי חלילי חלל לי.**—[סעדיה לוננו]. *מנחה לדוד 214.
361. **אנה עזב אל המון מעיו.**—סליחה-סי' א"ב, האיי [נאון]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 23.
362. **אנוש יביט למראה האנשים.**—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
363. **אנוש עובר ושב ואין לו דעת קרב.**—[יהודה מצליח פאדובה]. *מבחר-
שירמן 354.
364. **אנחה הראיתי והשא השאתי ביען נלאיתי.**—סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה 98
(מגיע רק עד יו"ד) —[בכ"י אדלר 3240 נמצא פיוט זה בשלמותו-סופו: תעבור על פשע
ותמחול רשע ותחיש עת ישע ... מימך].
365. **אנחנו הצאן ואתה רוענו.**—סי' אברהם [יוסף חי?]. *רשימה-שירמן 33.
366. **אני אז נראיתי כבושם ערוגות.**—שמנה עשרה פסח [קליר?]. *ערעלמן 3.
367. **אני אל האמת אטה לבבי.**—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 230.
368. **אני אמרתי אבוא בתפלה לפניך.**—[אברהם בן דניאל ממודינא].
*מבחר-שירמן 243.
369. **אני בה' אבטח ואני יושב בטח.**—סי' אני אברהם משה. *פ-יא 206.
370. **אני גבר בסבות הזמנים שבע רגז.**—[יחיאל בן יקותיאל מהעניס]. חתימה
לס' מעלות חמדות. *מבחר-שירמן 121.
371. **אני גבר יגון פרוד דחפו.**—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 180.

372. אני גומה כנדרגלות אימה.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר—שירמן 232.
373. אני גחל בתוך ברד.—שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 232.
374. אני האיש אשר עתק בתבל זה להגדילה.—[יששכר שמחה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 105.
375. אני היום מצאוני משחרים ונמצאתי לבקשת חברים.—שיר בראש ספרו כנפי נשרים [עמנואל בן יעקב]. *בערנהיימר—רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 152.
376. אני חצים אורה למשה המורה.—שיר בראש מכתב אליהו בשיצי למשה מקיעו—סי' אליהו [בשיצי]. *צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ה 347.
377. אני מלטתיך ממכואורים בכיאורם.—יוצר לשבת לך לך—סי' א"ב (רק התחלתו) [אלעזר]. *גנוי שירה 42.
378. אני סודי בתוך לבי צפנתיו ומשם כל ימותי לא אסירו.—מכתם [יוסף בן רם המכונה אבו אל עיש]. *כתאב ורוד ח"ב 13.
379. אני ספר בדקדוק אחו סודות ורזים.—שיר בשבח ספר הבחור [שמואל צרפתי]. *מערב ומורח 61.
380. אני ספר לבן־סינא מכנה וחליך אל בריאות, דוד, אשנה.—שיר בשבח ספר הקאנון לבן סינא [שמואל צרפתי]. *מערב ומורח 62.
381. אני קם לשטן לגדול וקטן.—[משה בן יואב]. *מבחר—שירמן 237.
382. אנכי הראיתי כבודי בנוגה ספקלר.—רהט לרס"ג. נוסד על עשרת הדברות וכל בית מסיים במלה שאולה משפות זרות. *הדאר, גליון היובל לשנת ה'ט"ו (ר' שבט תרצ"ו) עמ' 248.
383. אנשי זמן בבין ובמזמה קצו.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 50.
384. אנשי קדש שמעו לי.—סי' אני תנחום. *רשימה—שירמן 34.
385. אסדר פתגמין לעלמי עלמין קדם עתיק יומין.—ארמית. *פ—יא 16.
- אסומה פתוחה ממקור חכמות (6907).—ח"ו מן הקרובה לדברים ל"ג, א—סי' א'—ו' [יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 343.
386. אסוף אלהים חרפתי אויב חרף ישועתי.—סי' אברהם [אם] אות מ"ם מן אברהם ואחיות ח' ו' מן חזק נשמתו והמדפיס הניח מקום פנוי. *פ—יא 158.
387. אסיר תקותך אני והמוני.—סי' אהרן חבר. *תקופתנו 467.

388. **אסירי תקוה תתיר בשופר**.—לר'ה ס' א'ב. *גנוי שירה 14.
- אסלד לקורא הדורות בפענחי פלאיו בנבורות (6943).—ס' א'ב, בנימן חוק. *אמת ליעקב 142.
389. **אספר תהלות אל ויקרו אנא אדוני**.—ס' אני מרדכי [נרשום בראשו בשניאה: אברהם]. *תהלות לאל 22.
390. **אעורר זמרת רנני מיטב לקחי והגיוני**.—לכבוד השר באסאדור ס' פירו מפראנסא רייפובליק. ס' אני רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 18.
391. **אעיר זמרת רנני לכבוד חמדת ששוני**.—לחופת יוסף מרדכי אלבאן-ס' אני רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 6.
392. **אעיר לבבי ורעיוני לקרא כלם בשפה**.—(לא נמצא יותר). [יוסף אבן ששת]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 182.
393. **אערוך מספד תמרורים וקול נהי ארימה**.—קינה על חיים נסים אבולעפיא וישועה בסיס-ס' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 64.
394. **אערוך שירה חדשה לכבוד בוצינא קדישא**.—לכבוד רשב"י. —ס' אני רפאל משה אלבאן. *שיר חדש-ה' 20.
395. **אערוך תחנה לפני מלך עליון נעלה דר חביון**.—פיוט על הפרעושים מעין השיר שחבר ראב"ע על הזבובים. ס' אני רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 10.
396. **אפתח ביום שבת בשבח לקוני**.—שיר בעברית וערבית. ס' שלם בן יוסף אל[ש]בזי משתא. *חפץ חיים ח'ב ס' ד'. הערה: אות ש"ן מן אלשבזי חסרה.
397. **אפתח פי ואזמרה לאלהי במרומים**.—פ-יא 116.
398. **אצלי שני(?) שוב אלי כי אריה טרף רמס**.—ס' אברהם. *פ-יא 35.
399. **אצעקה במר לבי אוהבי זנחתני**.—אהבה ס' אבן ששת [יוסף]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 184.
400. **אקדישה לאל בנועם שנוני**.—ד' מלכנו-ס' א'-ה' (כל אות ג' פעמים). ו, ז', חוק [משה או יצחק אבן נקטילה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 84.
401. **אקו שמחת טיר עיר שלם הר צבי**.—ס' אברהם. *פ-יא 28.
402. **אקוה לאל רם נפשי לו תתעטף**.—ס' אני רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 19.
403. **אקרא לאלהים עליון השוכן שמי עליה**.—ס' יוסף חוק. *פ-יא 55.

404. אקרא צור עליון יושב סתר חביון. — תחנה-סי' צדקיה הרופא חזק [בן
בנימן מהענוים]. *מבחר-שירמן 100.
405. אקריב קרבן לך אל נורא בתוך מקדש. — סי' אבטליון. *פ-יא 32.
406. אקרע סגור לבי ויצורי כצל כלם. — קינה על חיים יהודה הכהן-סי' רפאל
[משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 60.
407. אקרע סגור לבי מבכי לא אחדל. — קינה על וידאל הצרפתי-סי' אני
רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 61.
- אראה כבוד תבל כעש יבל (7437). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 242.
408. אראה צביה עלתה על יתר כל יעלות. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי].
*מבחר-שירמן 228.
409. ארבע מלכיות קמו עלינו ועולם קשה הכבירו עלינו. — ח'ד (1) מן
הקרובה: אני אז נראיתי כבושם ערונות (לקליר?) סי' א"ב מגיע רק עד אות ה"א.
*עדעלמן 5.
410. ארבעה כתרים הצנפת יום שביעי. — אופן-סי' א"ב, לעזר [המור] מיחסו
לקליר, וצ"ע. *חורב ב' 7.
411. ארבעים ושתים מסעות סע עם אל. — ח"ו מן הקרובה: אחריו המשכחה
קהלים-סי' א'-ע'. *וולאי 35.
412. ארה מורי ובינה את דברי. — התחלת המאמר הראשון מן ספר בתי הנפש
והלחשים-סי' אני לוי בר אברהם בן חיים. *צינבערג-נעשיכטע ח"ג 399 [המור]
מוסיף את השם "צבי" אחר "חיים" כאלו היה שמו של אבי אביו של המחבר. "חיים צבי",
אולם אעפ"י שהאותיות צבי נמצאו בראשי החרוזים בכל זאת אינן רק על פי
מקרה, או ר"ת של "צדיק באמונתו יחיה" ולא שם פרטי].
- † ארומם אאמיר את ה'. — ע"י אאדיר כבוד ה'.
413. ארומם בשחר ליוצר כל נברא. — סי' אלק[ל]ע? *רשימה-שירמן 41.
- ארוממך ה' כי דלתני (2000*). — כל חלק פותח בפסוק מן תהלים פרק ל', סי' א"ב
(כפול), שמואל השלישי בחבורה. *ידיעות המכון ג' 168.
- ארוממך אלהי כל ימותי (7537). — *העולם שנה י"ח (תר"ץ) גליון כ"ח עמ' 559.
414. א'רחות מישרים להסליל לישרים ע'ת אקבץ פוזרים
ז'מירות. . . . — סי' אלעז [זה כל מה שיש לפנינו]. *גנוי שירה 40.
415. ארחמך צורי ונפשי עד תברך שמך. — סי' יוסף [אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות
המכון ב' 171.

- 416 ארִיד בשיחי ואהימה לתנות מימים ימימה.—קִינָה על עמור אביטבול—
סִי' אֲנִי רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שִׁיר חדש-ה' 62.
- 417 ארנן שמך לעד אל רם בגבורה.—סִי' אהרן. *פ-יא 116.
- 418 ארקות וגם שמי שפרה בחכמה ובבינה ובגבורה.—יוצר לשבת
בראשית-סִי' א'-ל', אלעזר בירבי. *ננוי שירה 41.
- 419 אש אהבים נסקה בי ואיך אתאפקה.—שִׁיר אזור [שמואל הנגיד].
*ידיעות המכון ב' 139.
- 420 אש הנדוד גבר ועצם עד שרף לבבי בי ומעים.—[מאיר הלוי
אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 82.
- 421 אש מלבבי ומעיני זרמים.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 70.
- 422 אש נודכם דודי בי קדחתם.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 41.
- 423 אש תאוה טבעית והלהב תרפה רוזן פנים.—[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת
ליהודה 65.
- 424 אשא משלי ואחוד ולפועלי אתן ייחוד.—התחלת הספר אשא משלי שהוא
שִׁיר בן כ"ב שערים [רס"ג]. *תרביץ ג' 155–160 (ע"י ב. מ. לוין); שם 386–390 (ע"י מאנן);
אלמה א' 58–62 (ע"י בראדי); מחקרים 15–24 (ע"י דודזון).
- 425 אשא עיני אל ההרים מאין יבא ישועות.—סִי' אברם. *פ-יא 66.
- 426 אשא עיני אל רם ונשא אשר הוא לי משען ומחסה.—*תקופתנו 452.
- 427 אשב במצרים כמו חדש.—[משה בן שמואל צפתי]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"ב 248.
- 428 אשה בכל אלה ראי דרכך עת עז.—[יעקב בן יצחק סגרי]. *מבחר—
שירמן 264.
- 429 אשורר שִׁיר בקול רנה וזמר תוך ריעי וגם אחי.—שִׁיר בסוף ס' הוהר
(כ"י) [משה בן ירמיה]. *לעזוי-רשימה 92.
- 430 אשות זה לי לא שוה אתאודה.—[יעקב פראנשיס]. *מבחר-שירמן 277.
- 431 אשיחה במר נפשי קינה מיבעי לי.—קִינָה על יהודה אלבאז-סִי' רפאל
משה [אלבאז]. *שִׁיר חדש-ה' 59.
- 432 וא . . . שִׁים ב . . . ענבים טובים ולא באושים.—שִׁיר חתימה לאחד
מספרי תנ"ך (כ"י) - סִי' א"ב, יצחק. *רשימת כ"י של כה"ק ח"א עמ' 76.
- 433 אשיר במצלתיים בשפה ברורה על עשרים ושתים אותיות
התורה.—*פ-יא 89.

434. אשיר שיר לאלהים חיים ומלך עולם. —סי' אחרן. *פ-יא 120.
435. אשיר שירה חדשה לאל קדוש רם ונשא. —פיוט לשבת-סי' א'ב, עמור [אביטבול]. *תהלות לאל 16.
436. אשירה אשירה אל צרור המור. —סי' אבטליון. *פ-יא 5.
437. אשירה נא לידידי חתן חמודי לכה דודי לקראת כלה. —סי' אליהו חזק [חזן]. *הגדה 1896 (מעבר לשער).
- † אשירה שיר ידידות לאל עליון. —עי' נעימות פאר תורתנו לא יסלה.
438. אשל טע אורח ביאר באיבו עובר אורח. —*גנוי שירה 64. [כאן מובא בטעות בהתחלה זו: „אב המון ואורח באהלו הסעיר עוברי אורח“. הנוסח הנכון נמסר לי מפי דר. שפיגל].
439. אשם לכפר וכחש וסדרים במזבח. —זה כל מה שנשאר מסדר עבודה ליוכ"פ. *גנוי שירה 72.
440. אשמח בכוסי ואשיש ארד ואבא לגני. —[מדרס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 72.
441. אשפוך שיחי לפני רם ונשא. —סי' אני רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 1.
442. אשקוט ואביט במכוני חי פרץ שם עלה. —סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 37.
443. אשר עתידים להירבות מזרעכם. —ח'ו מקרובה שראשיתה חסרה-סי' א'ב, יהודה. *זולאי 76.
444. אשר שבילו התמים בכנ נמלט משטף זעמים. —יוצר לשבת נח-סי' א'ב, אלעזר בירבי. *גנוי שירה 42.
445. אשרי אנוש יוליד ילדים יחיו כל עוד היות שמש עלי רקיע. —שיר שנשלח לר' משה קמחי בענין פירושו על משלי. *לעוו-רשימה 34.
446. אשרי תמימי מסלה אשרי לא ישובו לכסלה. —קיקלר-סי' א'ב [כל אות כפולה ט' פעמים מלבד א' שהיא כפולה רק ח' פעמים סי' הא"ב מגיע רק עד אות הראשונה של זי'] עם חרוז חזר סי' אלעזר בירבי קליר. *חרוב א' 164; גנוי שירה 17.
447. את כהני למקדשים היו מפרישים. —עבודה קטנה ליוכ"פ —סי' אברהם בן יצחק חזן [נהמ"ל חב"ד משער שבכל זאת אפשר שהפיוט הזה שייך לר' הא"י גאון כי יש לנו כמה פיוטים שחברם הגאון על שם ר' אברהם בן יצחק החזן]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 46.
448. את צמח דוד מהרה תצמיח כתר בראשו יאיר ויזריח. —סי' מאיר. *פ-יא 71.

449. את קולך עמי שמעתי וקשבתי להאזינה. —סי' א'—ג' [קליר?]. *חורב א' 158; גנוי שירה 21.
450. אתאנו לך בחין לסוחחה. —פיוט ליוכ"פ—סי' א'ב עם שני חרוזים חוזרים סי' אלעזר [קליר?]. *חורב א' 156; גנוי שירה 19.
451. אתאנו לפניך כדלים ואביונים. —פתיחה—סי' א'ב, משה ברבי שבתי חוק. *מבחר—שירמן 60.
452. אתה אדון האדונים שלח לנו ציר אמונים. —סי' אני מנחם. *פ—יא 191.
453. אתה אדון ואני עבד ומי ירחם על עבד. —תחנונה—סי' א'ב. *תקופתנו 449.
454. אתה אהוב לבי כמו נפשי אבל אין נפשך באהבה נקשרת. —סי' אני משה בן שמואל הקורא לאל צפתי. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"ב 245.
455. אתה אל עושה פלא רבות עשית ישעי ואורי. —סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש ה' 20.
456. אתה אפדת שפריר על קו ממדיך. —סי' א'ב (כפול). *פיוטים ספרדיים 21.
- אתה בקרבנו מלך בנו נקרא שמך מלך (8712). —סי' א'ב. *אמת ליעקב 144.
457. אתה האל עושה פלא הודעת עוזך בעמים. —זמר לחנוכה—סי' שם של מ"ב (בראשי החרוזים), משה (בסוף כל חרוז). [משה מענדלש אב"ד ור"מ רק"ק פראג.] *נדפס על דף בודר בערך 1706—1715 שייך למר יצחק ריבקינד (עי' העולם 1933 גליון ל"ב עמ' 479 סי' ד').
458. אתה הוא ה' האלהים אשר עשית את השמים ואת הארץ. —תפלה מעין שמנה עשרה. *הברמן—תפלות 36.
459. אתה הוא עד לא עולם נברא. —גשמת—סי' אני יצחק בן יהודה [גיא]. *חורב ב' 256.
460. אתה יום וקרבו ימים ללון להקיץ לקץ הימין. —ח"ו מן קרובה לדברים לא, י"ד. סי' א'ב (מניע רק עד אות ח"ת). [יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 341—342.
461. אתה מחסי אל נאזר בגבורה. —*פ—יא 139.
462. אתה נתתה גפן שוריקה משובחה היתה מכל הגפנים. —גיל שצ"ל: אתה נטעתה וכו'. שיר חתימה לאחד מספרי תנ"ך (כ"י). סי' א'ב. *רשימת כ"י של כה"ק עמ' 270.
463. אתה ראשון אתה הוא אחרון אין אל מבלעדיך. —סי' שמואל. *פ—יא 92.

464. אתה תומך רוחי מבטן גוחי מצרה מרויחי. —לפורים—סי' א'—פ'.
*גנוי שירה 63.
465. אתה תקום תרחם ציון עזרינו מגינינו מירושלים. —תפלה על סדר
שמנה עשרה של חול—סי' א'—צ'. *הברמן—תפלות 46.
466. אתויים עדיך להלוך באימרה אדיר ימלוך. —סי' א"ב (רק עד צ').
*גנוי שירה 96.
467. אתחיל לשביח אל עליון בוחן לב וכליון. —סי' א"ב [נמשה בן שמואל
הקראי]. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"ב 213.
468. אתחננה לאל ואוחילה פניו. —חתימה לספר הוהר ע"י הכותב משה בן ירמיה.
*לעווי—רשימה 91.
469. אתי מלבנון כלה תשורי מראש אמנה פצחי נא שיר. —סי' אברהם
חוק. *פ—יא 38.
470. אתיא ואף תמהיא עבד עמנא אלהא עילהא. —ארמית—סי' אברהם חי.
*פ—יא 17.
471. אתמה זקנה אם לבב בעליך עוד כל ימי עולם תחדהו. —[נסעדיה
לוגנן]. *זואת ליהודה 66.
472. אתמול לאליה בינה ילדתני. —שיר בשבח ספר הבחור. [שמואל צרפתי].
*מערב ומורח 61.
473. אתן את מלכי הודות עד אשר תלין גני. —סי' אברהם [ס]. *פ—יא 50.
474. אתן לדר מעונה חמדה ושינה. —עברית ולועזית—סי' אני שמואל חוק.
*פ—יא 174.
475. אתן שבח לאל אלהי ישראל המלך הגואל את עבדו אפרים. —
שיר של המעתיק פי' רד"ק—סי' אפרים [בר מתתיה הצרפתי]. *בערנהיימר—רשימה
כ"י אמברוזיאנא 29.
476. אתן שירה אל אל נורא כי הוא ברא חמר צורה. —שיר בסוף פירוש
על החזרה (כ"י) [נמשה הגולה מקיעון]. *צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ה 348.
- אתן תהלה לרם על כל ברכה (8960). —סי' א"ב (מרבץ) מן סוף אות עי"ן עד סוף הא"ב.
*עדעלמן 25—26.
477. באור יקר הנו נשלם גלי רז תורת משה. —[נמשה הגולה מקיעון].
*צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ה 350.
478. באין דבר אשר קדמו. —*רשימה—שירמן 52.

479. באשה אל תהי נפשך בטוחה.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 76.
480. באשה מעלות אם שלשו.—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
481. בבא האנחות כאיל שלוחות ונסו שמחות בארץ עדינה.—קנה על מצור עיר פיורנצא מחיל קארלאס החמישי (1529–1530) [משה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 373.
482. בבחרותו גבר כמו בן נץ יאבר.—[סעדיה לוננו]. *חזקת ליהודה 69.
483. בגב עינך צבית חן סגולה.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 224.
484. בגילה באהבה אשיר מלך.—[שלמה מבורך]. *רשימה-שירמן 53.
485. בדבר אמת תדבק והרחק מדבר כזב.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 81.
486. בא אך אויבי חרה בי.—*פ-יא 137.
487. בא יבא נושה [צ"ל נושא] ברינה הילד במקהלות.—*פ-יא 137.
488. בא ידידי בא לי גשה נא ושק.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 46.
489. בא ידידי כי בבואך צרי אל נפשות.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 46.
- בבואי כלה בואי כלה ברינה בשמחה ובצהלה.—ע"י אשירה נא לידידי חתן חמודי.
490. בקר אקום מתוך עמלי.—*רשימה-שירמן 62.
491. ... כותים משוש ... ש ליושב תהילה.—שריד משמונה עשרה. *עדעלמן 32.
492. ... בז זר יהיר קפץ שלל מחמדים.—לפורים-סי' ב'-צ'. *גנוי שירה 61.
493. בזה יום אולי מצוא רצון מאיום.—קדושה למנחה יוכ"פ. *גנוי שירה 107.
494. בזמן שנה זמן שנה אני ישנה לעדנה.—[יצחק בן משה לוריא המגיה]. *שער בת רבים ח"א דף ש"ס ע"א.
495. בועם א ארץ באימת המביט לארץ.—יוצר רעש שביעי'. כל חלק פותח בתיבה מחבוק ג', י"ב – סי' א"ב. *ידיעות המכון ג' 156.

496. בחור כארזי אל נדח בתוך רודפי. *רשימה-שירמן 56.
- יבִּחצוצרות ובקול שופר רון תרועה ישפר. ח'ו מן השבעתא: אומן מצורים אל חתה.
- בטחוני בקוני חסיני מגיני (403). *ספר היוכל לפרופיסר קרויס עמ' 196.
497. בי אל דבר אל דבר יום קרבני אל הר סיני השמע עם קול אלהים. סי' יוס[ף]. *פ-יא 91.
498. בידך אפקיד רוחי בשרי ודמי כאחת. סליחה לשחרית יוכ'פ-סי' בנימן [בן אברהם מהעניס] חזק. *מבחר-שירמן 95.
499. בידך עתותי הצילני בצל כנפך תסתירני. סי' בנימן. *פ-יא 213.
500. ביום אראה הדר מראך צביה. [משה בן יואב]. *מבחר-שירמן 236; ירחון ע"ז 377.
501. ביום נהפך הדר תבל לתבל. [מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
- בין תבינו לקנות בינה (546). *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 511.
- בינות אריות ובינות לבאים (557). סליחה על ר' יצחק הבחור אשר קדש השם במירצבורק. *כ"י המבורג סי' 133 דף 115. עי' רמש"ש-רשימת המבורג עמ' 50. סאלפעלד-מארטירולוגיום 149 הע' 3.
502. בירושלים חשוקי יה העלה באמת. *פ-יא 138.
503. בכאוב (?) נפשי כי כל דבשי נשבה ממני. סי' משה. *רשימה-שירמן 57.
504. בכל דבר קנה חכמה אנושית. *כה לחי 6.
505. ... בכשרון ונלא בכשלון. שריד מפיוט-סי' א"ב (נשאר רק מן אות כ' עד ת'). *עדעלמן 31.
506. בלום פיך בעת תחשוב לדבר ואז נפשך תנצל ממצוקה. מכתם. *כתאב ורוד ח"ב 13. כה לחי 7.
- בלי תקוה ולא חדוה (719). *דבר, כ"ט אלול תרצ"ו.
507. בליל שמח לבבי בו ועלץ. שיר י"ן. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 232.
508. במגורי ידידי אריד כי נותרו שאיה. [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 260.

509. **במו פי אדבר אמרים אחר.**—[נח בן ישעיה מטרק]. *צינבערג-נעשיכטע ח"ה 357.
510. **במוצאי מנוחה הקרה לנו רוחה ה' סלחה.**—*רשימה-שירמן 59.
511. **במצרף שים גוי עולים [?] כסף מסים יורים.**—*פ-יא 63.
512. **בן אדם אל תאשם נפשך ברוב עבדיך.**—תוכחה-סי' אבב, גדר, וכו' [אברהם בן חלפון]. *מנחה לדוד 194.
513. **בן אדם שמע את אשר אני מדבר אליך.**—תוכחה. סי' א"ב, אברהם בן חלפון. *מנחה לדוד 190.
514. **בן דוד שלח מהרה אודה שמך.**—סי' אני יצחק סלמה. *רשימה-שירמן 60.
515. **בני איש הזמן בטחם וכסלם.**—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 79.
516. **בני דע כי תחי נכר בשלש.**—[יוסף בן רם המכונה אבולעיש]. *כה לחי 8. בני שים לב למסכתות ערוכות (*110).—*רבעון האנגלי (מ"ח) כ"ה 432. בנפשי דוד ונחוני יצוריו (1064).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 22.
517. **בעדן גן זמיר מבין עפאים.**—תוכחה-שלמה בן ראובן בונפיד. *לקט שירים 4.
518. **בעוד אחיה ערבים לי הליכי.**—[משה זכות]. *מבחר-שירמן 307.
519. **בעודי חי לעין אחי אסובב מכון שבתך.**—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 223.
520. **בעורך רעננה כזמורה בהבשיל אשכלותיך ענבים.**—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 225.
521. **בעת קנאי יקנא כך ראותך בהצלחה.**—[יצחק די ליאון ממשרורי מצרים]. *כה לחי 9.
522. **בציון ינופף אחד לכל החוברים.**—חרוזה של שני בתים להשלים מצות עשה אשר באזהרות ר' אליהו הוקן (אמת יהנה חכי) סיסר ר' משה מפונטיווא. *קובץ על יד, י"א 8.
- בצרתה לי בקראי עצרות (*1288).—*מבחר-שירמן 97. [הערה: לפי הסימן צריך שהחרוז ה"ב יתחיל באות נו"ן מן השם, כנימ"ן אבל בדפוס הנ"ל מתחיל בתיבה, במתנ" ולכן יש לשער שנפלה כאן טעות בהעתקה וחרוז י"א צ"ל: גוים במתג וברסן מתעה על לחיהם' וחרוז י"ב צ"ל: נפת שוא להניפהם].

523. בקול זמרה ושיר תודה נהלל אלהינו אשר עזר עבדיו להשלים מחזור. — *רומא ב' (בסוף הספר).
524. בקראי ענני אלהי צדקי. — סי' שלמה מבורך חזק. *רשימה-שירמן 64.
525. בקוראי ענני מידי דברי בעצתך תנחני. — סי' בנימין [?]. *פ-יא 63.
526. בקש שיר איש כלבבו יחסה בו. — סי' רפאל משה אלבאז. *שיר חדש-ה' 23.
527. בראש הנבונים מתי ניב והגיון. — [משה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 379.
528. ברב צפצפו סיס ותור. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 31.
- ברוח נשברה הסחופתי במקדשך (1398). — *אמת ליעקב 135.
529. ברוך אדון כל ומכל מכוסה ברוך הוא. — פיוט לברוך שאמר-סי' א'ב [מרבץ]. *כפא-כ"י 56.
530. בא"י אמ"ה אקב"ו לקבל עלינו עול מלכות שמים ולהמליכו בלבב שלם. — ברכה לפני ק"ש על המטה. *אבודרהם 23; ועי' געאוניקא ח"א 135, 136.
531. בא"י אמ"ה בורא מיני כסאנין. — ברכה על מיני תרגימא. *תוספתא ברכות ד' 4.
532. בא"י אמ"ה רופא חולים. — ברכה מברכות השחר. *סר"ע 1.
533. ברכי יחידתי אדון כל מר. — [אחיטוב הרופא מפלירמו]. *ידיעות המכון 144.
534. בשחר אקום להודות את פני אדוני ה'. — סי' [י' צחק]. *תהלות לאל 11.
535. בשם אל אשר ברא כל יש אשר נברא. — *רשימה-שירמן 66.
536. בשפת ידידי רוק מאד ערב. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 29.
537. בשרנו יה חיש תביא את אליהו הנביא. — סי' אפרים בן צלח ס"ט. *חופת חתנים-קונין ח"ב 2.
538. בתהילות תוקף בשינוני שבח. — פיוט לסכות-סי' תשר"ק (כל אות ב' פעמים). *עדעלמן 31.
539. בתמהון יעקב נפשך צלולה. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-שירמן 229.
540. גביר המעולה בחכמה מסולה. — שיר לכבוד דון שם טוב בן יצחק ארדוטיאל. [שמואל בן יוסף נ' שושן]. *מנחה לדוד 201.

541. גבר, בעת תרעב זמן תחרף. — [סעדיה לוננו]. *זואת ליהודה 69.
542. גבר בתבל צידה מחסר. — [סעדיה לוננו]. *זואת ליהודה 68.
543. גוי דל המס חמודי נוד כעש. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 14.
544. ... גיעת עתירת גיאה עתיר מנוטירת. — שריד מפיט ליום כפורים — סי' א'ב (אותיות א' ב' חסרות). *ארמן 80.
545. גלומי אורך העטייתי מיום החלותני. — אהבה לשבת מצורע — סי' א-י. *גנוי שירה 115.
546. גשם אוצרות שפרה ברכותיך לנו העשירה. — פיוט לנשם סי' א'-ט'. *מחקרים 174.
547. גשם אוצרך תרוה איומתך. — פיוט לנשם — סי' א'-ט'. *מחקרים 170.
548. דבר בתוך עירך פזר רגלך. — [משה חיים בן אברהם קטלאנו]. *מבחר — שירמן 272.
- דבריק בעט שכל חקוקים (64). — *רמב"ע — דיואן 239.
- דבריק הם כמו דברי נבואות (42). — *דיואן — ד"א הבבלי 283.
550. דדי יפת תאר ליל חבק. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע — דיואן 250.
551. דוד בנביאים בין וחברתם בחר. — [יצחק די ליאון ממשוררי מצרים]. *כה לחי 10.
552. דודי ברח מני ערבה כל שמחה. — סי' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חרש-ה' 24.
553. דודי נא שבו עצמותי יגרם פרודכם. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ח"א 37.
554. דודי צח ואדום דגול מרבבה בנה מקדש אדום. — סי' דוד חזק. *פ-יא 72.
555. דודי שלח ידו לקדש אשת נעורים. — כתובה לחנן השבועות — סי' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חרש-ה' 57.
556. דודים שוררו אהבה עוררו. — [ראב"ע ?] *תרביץ ה' 66; אולי זה אחד עם סי' 34*.
557. די לאנוש מהון ומעושר שלא יהא רעב ולא צמא. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 54.

558. די לך נקמה ממקנא בך תשמח והוא דאג בשמחתך. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 80.
559. דין עיר ציון לטוב תבנה. —ס' יצחק. *פ-יא 159.
560. ... דמיון פניו כמראה ברק בכנף מעופף. —החרח הרביעי של חלק הקרובה לשבועות המתחיל בכ"י: אריאל אש רקומתו. *גנוי שירה 87; עי' ג'כ שם עמ' 132.
- דמעות עשוקי אהבה נגרו (53*) —[רמ"ה אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 16.
561. דמעי יגרו מחם לבבי אשר נקרע שנים עשר קרעים. —[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע-דיואן 171.
562. דמעי ראם אדומים כדם. —[שדרוס אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון ח"א 78.
563. דע כי חלי רע הוא אשר תאמר דבר לאדם לא יבינהו. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 61. כה לחי 11.
564. דפקו על דל עשיר ודל. —[סעדיה לונגו.] *זואת ליהודה 69.
565. דרך אניה בלב ים שים פעמיך לבי. —[יוסף בן יהודה זאק.] *מבחר-שירמן 191.
566. דרך בבר שהם ודר כוכב זבול עזב. —[שדרוס אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון ח"א 63.
567. הא אלמים צחות ידברו. —[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע-דיואן 31.
- הא לך מכתב מאח נכאב (8). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 130.
568. האומר ועושה אין זולתך. —צלוה לר' אלעזר קלר-ס' א"ב *גנוי שירה 11 (מגיע רק עד אות נו"ן); חורב 161 (נרפס בשלמות).
569. האומרים לכילי שוע הבוחרים בשיקוצי תעב. —חלק י"א מן קדושתא ליו"כפ: ארץ בזמר סלסלה. ס' א"ב [ניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 269.
570. האוצר ים המים העליונים מעל לרקיע. —חלק מקרובה-ס' אלב"ם. *גנוי שירה 82.
571. האל אמיץ ומחוסן בגובה רומו. —ס' א"ב. *כפא-כ"י 107.
572. האל המאוזר כח וגבורה בהיר ומהולל בכל חבורה. —ס' א"ב. *כפא-כ"י 112.
573. האל הנאדר הנבחר הנגדל הנדרש. —ס' א"ב. *כפא-כ"י 107.

574. האספו עליו עדת נבונים ועשו היום מספד וקנים. — [יוסף אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 173.
575. הב הב לך יאמר ולא ישבע. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 74.
576. הבא כלי שיר והבא יין. — [מדרס אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ח"א 88.
577. הבו בנות עיני ואל תכלאו. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 53.
578. הגבור אל אזור בגבורה הגבור בבקיעת שחר באורה. — סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 108.
579. הגבור באלפי אילי תרשישים. — סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 113.
580. הגדול באלפי אראלים הגדול בבני אלים. — סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 108.
581. הגדול התקיף דר במעוני הגדול שיר ושבח בלשוני. — סי' תשר"ק. *כפא—כ"י 112.
582. הדור ראו אתם כי אין כמוהו. — שיר בשבח הספר. *הגדה—1716 (מעבר לשער) — ד"ר 1758 (מעבר לשער).
583. הדסה עת תשורר שיר. — מן מקאמת טוביה (המ"ל מיחסו לר"י חריוי, וצ"ע). *חורב א' 184.
584. הדרן עלך גט פשוט בלי פיקפוק אך קשוט. — חתימה למס' בבא בתרא כ"י ב"מ 17052. Add. *רשימת ב"מ ח"ב 94 (סי' 475).
585. הוא המדבר מבלי לשון דמע אשר יגר כמי פישון. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 222.
586. הודו למלך רום ימינו טפחה. — שיר תהלה [האיי גאון ?]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 57 (רק ההתחלה).
587. הוי כל צמאי דת לכו למים. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 22.
588. הורות נבוכים חן ולקח טוב. — [יעקב בן עזרא גבאי]. *צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ב 170.
589. הושענא אל אמונה אום שרה מראש אמנה. — התחלת שמונה עשרה להושענה רבה—סי' א'—ג' (כל אות כפולה ד' פעמים). מיוחס בכ"י הגניזה לר' אלעזר [קליר ?]. *ספר היובל לקרויס 309.

590. הזכירו חסדי אל אומה קדושה.—סי' עמור אביטבול. *תהלות לאל 15:
- †. . . החיש מפצר(?) המבאיש ככה יעשה לאיש.—*גנוי שירה 58 נבדף בודר שמכיל תקונים העיר המו'ל שהתחלת השורה הזאת היא: 'קילוס מרדכי החיש מפי צר המבאיש' ואינו המשך הפיוט הקודם בעמ' 57 והעיר ג'כ שמצא ראשיתו של הפיוט אבל לא הביאה שם]. 'עי' להלן סי' 1160.
592. החתן הזה יברכהו אלי ויתברך כברכת משה ועלי.—*חפץ חיים חיב (והללויה סי' ט').
593. החתן הזה שמרהו אל כבן פרץ.—סי' שלמה בן דוד. *חפץ חיים (והללויה סי' ב').
594. החתן יכהן פאר וכלה תעדה כליה אפאר לאל בקול המולה.—סי' אלעזר חזק. *רשימה—שירמן 72.
595. הטא אזנו לי מחוללי ובימי אקרא.—פ-יא 167.
- ‡הטל יופטר והגשם יעוטר.—'עי' אוהלו שני אחים.
596. . . . היום לא תקצר רוחהו.—סוף ח'ד מן קרובה לר' ישועה החבר בירבי נתן שראשה חסר והיא קינה על מות בנו יאשיהו—סי' [יאשי]הו שמו נוחו ערן. *ידיעות המכון ב' 178.
597. . . . היורד מועף ביעף.—חלק מקרובה—סי' א'ב (נשארו אותיות יורד—למ'ד). *גנוי שירה 84.
598. היתנבית צדקה לבאי לעת ריב.—שריר מקרובה לר'ה—סי' ה'—ת' (כל אות ב' פעמים, אותיות א'—ד' חסרות). *עדעלמן 5.
599. הכה בשבטו רב לתלמיד על גוו.—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
600. הכוס אשר עינה כעין יינה.—שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 232.
601. הכרת ליל ברית ביני ובינו.—[יוסף אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 167.
602. הלא זקנה תבלה כל הויה.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר—שירמן 226.
603. הלעד מעלות שמחה שפלות.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 48.
604. המבדיל אותנו מן העמים.—שני בתים בסוף שיר ערבי. *צדמ'ג מ"ט 567.
- ‡המנורה גלה במשוש נחמה.—המשך מן ח"א של הקרובה: וזה אלי בנס הנסיסי. המסלע לך לבי חרושה (780).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 218.

605. המרומם על כל ברכה שם בפי עניו זאת הברכה. —ח'ד מן הקרובה:
לסדר דברים לג, א [ניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 338.
606. הן אל יתמה על החפץ כל הרואה טורים אלה. —*טורים-קרימונה
(בסוף חלק חשן משפט).
607. הן באמת אתם כמו סהר אשר תחת בגדיו ליל וחשך ימש. —
[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 72.
608. הן המשושים באדרים דרים. —שיר שלח לרון שם טוב בן יצחק ארדוטיאל
[שמואל בן יוסף י' שושן]. *מנחה לדוד 201.
609. הן הפרי אתמול כמת היה. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ
על יד, י"א 68.
610. הן כל נשיאי הזמן כלם רוח סערה הם בלי גשם. —[רש"ט פלקירה
בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 50.
611. הן לפיד אש ישחית עצמו. —*כה לחי 12.
612. הן עת אשר לא אחזה פניך פי עם לבבי יהמו. —שיר אל שלמה
מבונציפונציאו (S. da Poggibonsi) [משה בן יואב]. *ירחון ע"ז 380.
613. הנבכי ים ואם מימי דמעות. —[ר"א הבבלי]. *מאנן-טעקס ח"א 304
(רק ההתחלה).
614. הנה אני שברי בלב ים הזמן הרע אשר פרש לרגלי רשת. —[מאיר
הלוי בן טדרוס אבולעאפיה]. *נויביוער-צלומים, צלום xviii; ידיעות המכון-ב' 36.
615. [הנה בני יום?] כאבותם בגדו. —[יוסף אבן סהל]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 149.
- הנה ברך לקחתי. —ע' שפר זה הספר.
616. הנה הני נשי במאי זכין על משבצות. —[יעקב בן יצחק סגרי]. *מבחר-
שירמן 264.
617. הנה יליד סכלות אשר הוליד מרבה דברים מבלי ענין. —[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע דיואן 96.
618. הנה מה טוב פי המלך לשמור. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות
המכון א' 92.
619. היננו אתאנו לך בארבעה הילולים להללך. —פיוט להושענא רבה-
בלי סי' [קליר?]. *ספר היובל לקרויס 310.
- הנני מעלה לך מרפא וארוכה. —ע' אויל מאוצר להשביעך.

620. הנערה יפה בעיני אהבה תביט. — [סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת ליהודה 66.
621. הנפשי בחרו לשכן יגונות. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 122.
622. הנר כל עוד שמנו מצער. — [שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *תרביץ ח' 66.
- הסכת ושמע ישראל אגודים לחנך כהואל ונעריצך אין כאל (939). — סי' בנימן בר וכל אות נ' פעמים [שמואל סופר]. *אמת ליעקב 141.
623. הסר כעס מלבך ואכל מליהם כצופים. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 75.
624. הסתכלי נפשי ושורי פועלך. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר שירמן 232.
625. הפוערים פיהם בלי חק גוזרים דבר. — [שמשון כהן מודון]. *מבחר—שירמן 351.
626. הפעם אודה לאדני כי לכדתי קרית ספר. — שיר בשבח הספר [מאיר בן יעקב מפרניצו הדר בויניציאה]. *יורה דעה ד"ו 1551 (בסוף הספר).
627. הצבי עיניו ישיקו להטי חרבות יריקו. — [יוסף אבן ברזל]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 176.
628. הצופה מה עתיד והבוטה מה להיות. — חלק ח' מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו—בלי סי'. *ידיעות המכון ב' 263.
629. הקשב דבר מוסר וגרש הכסיל ממך. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 51.
630. ... הקשיבה שועת אום זנוחה. — סופו של פיוט שראשו בלתי נודע—סי' צ'—ת'. *חורב א' 157; גנזי שירה 20.
631. הראותי ברכות או רהטים. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 79.
632. הרב לשבר רעך שיחך ובכה לאחיך במר רוחך. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 38.
633. הרבה אהה עצבוני חשק. — [שדרוס אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון א' 36.
634. הרימות בכל חסד דגלים. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 14.
635. הרף בוכה חקי בתים אחרי ילדי אהב נצדים. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 47.

636. הרפו מנחמי שוא לאב שכל. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה. *ידיעות המכון ב' 42.]
637. השמר מבא בית מלך ולדבקה בו פן תורש. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 63.
638. השתעשעה תמיד באגרת אשר יקרו אמריה. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 88.
639. השתעשעו ושעו כצור חזקו. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר-שירמן 233.
640. התומכים ממזר לאליל השוחחים להבל וריק. — חלק מן קדושתא ליר'כפ. סי' תשרק [ניין]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 269; גנזי שירה 80.
641. התיצבו נגדי מזרות הזבול. — [משה וכות.] *מבחר-שירמן 306.
642. ואם רחקת צביה ממגורי. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר-שירמן 223.
643. ואם תרצה פתוח יד אלהים. — [מנחם די לונזאנו.] *שתי ידות 149.
644. ואמרו לי שמח כי טוב שמוח. — [מנחם די לונזאנו.] *שתי ידות 149.
645. ... ואראה שוכני שחק. — חלק מקרובה לשבועות, ראשיתה חסרה רק ש'-ח' נשארו. עי' נויבויער רשימה-סי' 2712/14 דף פ"ט. *גנזי שירה 86.
646. וארו חיוה אחרי תינינא ביחלתני ביעתתני. — רהט לפורים-סי' א"ב. *גנזי שירה 53.
647. וארץ אז מכנפיה תשמיע ומירות. — סי' א"ב *כפא-כ"י 110.
648. וארץ לאבות ובנים אמנת. — סי' א"ב *כפא-כ"י 115.
649. ואתה אלוה סליחות מעמקי תחתיות. — חלק מקדושה-סי' אח"בש [מניע רק עד אות צד' ומכיון שהוא נקשר עם הפיוט הקודם לו שסי' שלו הוא שלמה, בודאי שייך פיוט זה ג"כ לשלמה, המ"ל מיחסו בטעות לקליר.] *חורב ב' 16.
650. ובכן לעולם הטל סימן תחיה לעולם. — סלוק של הקרובה: איש תם בטוב אסמחה *ידיעות המכון ב' 230.
- וכרוב גאונך מהורר בכוס (130). — סי' מנחם. ... שמקהל אודרנט מוהל יחי. *ידיעות המכון א' 109.
651. ... ודניאל נגיד עם אל ומלכם. — שריד מפיזט. [ר"א הבבלי.] *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 294; *דיואן ר"א הבבלי 310.
652. והמטר אמת ירעם בקולות. — שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 233.

653. והנורא אלהים ממקדשו והנורא בברכת עם קדושו.—ס' א"ב.
*כפא 108.

654. והנורא בתילי תילים נתמנית.—ס' תשר'ק; *כפא—כ"י 113.

655. והשכמנו הלומי יין ידידת.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דואן 116.

656. וזאת אימן באמנותו וזאת בירך בביאתו.—ח"ו מן הקרובה לסדר דברים
ל"ג, א'. ס' א"ב [יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 340.

657. וזה אלי בנס הנסיסי ויאמר אהל להקים ולהשישי.—י"ח לחנוכה
דר' פינחס. הקרובה הזאת מתחלקת ל"ח בתים המקושרים עם י"ח הברכות של השמנה
עשרה לפי נוסח ארץ ישראל. כמסגרת ל"ח הבתים האלה השתמש הפייטן בפסוקים
מן התורה, הנביאים והכתובים (במדבר ח', ד'; זכריה ד', ב'; נחמיה י"ב, כ"ז). החרוז
הראשון מכל בית מתחיל בתיבה אחת או יותר מן הפסוק שבתורה, החרוז השני מתחיל
בתיבה מן הפסוק שבנביאים והחרוז השלישי מתחיל בתיבה שבפסוק מן הכתובים. אחר
התיבות האלו מתחילים הבתים באות אחת מאותיות הא"ב, היינו מן א' עד צ' (וכל אות
ג' פעמים, מלבד בשני הבתים הראשונים שבהם כל אות ד' פעמים) בין השניה והשלישית
של י"ח הברכות הפסיק הפייטן בפיוטים אחרים ולפי זה חלקי הקרובה הם: א. וזה
אלי וכו'—ס' א"ב (מקביל לשתי הברכות הראשונות). ב. פעולת מנורה חוריתה
באצבע—ס' פינחס. ג. נר חנוכה אורו יהי מיופה—ס' א"ב, פנחס הכהן חזק (אותיות
חז'ק כפולות ד' פעמים). ד. המנורה גלה במשוש נחמה—ס' ג'—צ' (המשך מן ח"א,
ומקביל לשש עשרה ברכות האחרונות של השמנה עשרה). *ידיעות המכון א' 163–174.

658. [ווחיות ארבע] בארבעה פנים בריאתם.—חלק מקדושה—ס' א"ב (כפול)
מה שחסר בראש הפיוט נשלם ע"י המו"ל והוא מיחסו בטעות לקליר, כי הפיוט הבא
אחריו נקשר עמו ס' שלו הוא שלמה. *חורב ב' 14.

וויבא עמלק בביתי גדודים.—ע"י או בנאלך חלק נחצץ כילק. *גנוי שירה 57.

... ויגביה מצריך מעוני (206).—המשך של השיר: „אלהיך יזכר“.

659. ויהי אזי דבר מחלץ ממהמור אל יונה שנית לאמר.—פיוט למנחה
יזכ"פ נוסד על פסוקי יונה ג' וד'—ס' א', אנכי, ב'—ת', יוסף [נאבן אביחור]. *פיוטים
ספרדיים 10. הערה: הבניה של הפיוט הזה היא שכל בית מתחיל בתיבה אחת או יותר
מן פסוקי יונה ג' וד', ואחר ההתחלה בא סימן הא"ב. לו אחז הפיטן בשיטה זו מבלי
לצאת ממנה כי אז היה בא פסוק א' מן פרק ג' עם אות א' של הא"ב בבית הראשון, ופסוק
ב' עם אות ב' של הא"ב בבית השני וכן הלאה. אבל הוא יצא משיטתו והכדיל בין פסוק
א' ופסוק ב' ובין פסוק ב' ופסוק ג', וגם פסוק ב' אינו בא עם אות ב' של הא"ב אלא
עם אות נו"ן, וכל זה כדי להכניס את הסימן „אנכי“ בשלשלת הבתים המתחילים: אני
ידעת, קום לך אל ינוה נאם מליך, כי יפנעו. אחר הסימן הזה סדר הפסוקים וסדר

הא"ב הולכים זה אצל זה אלא שפסוק ג' בא עם אות ב"ת של הא"ב בבית אחד, ופסוק ד' עם אות נ"מ"ל וכן הלאה עד שמגיע לפסוק י"ד שהוא האחרון בפרק ג' של יונה, ובבית זה נמצאת אות ט"ח של הא"ב. התחלת הפסוק הראשון של יונה ד' באה עם אות י"ד של הא"ב בבית אחד (בדפוס נתן הבית הזה בהערה) בשורה 15 צ"ל: ויתפלל כי נעצב כי שעה וכו'. הבית שהתחיל בפסוק ה' של יונה ד' והכיל אות נ"ן מן הא"ב חסר בכ"י. שורה 24 צריך להתחיל „ואני עדי" תחת „ואני עדי". בשורה 25 אפשר לנסח: „תמור יושב בה" בשר וכו' וע"י תקון זה יצא מן שורות 25–27 הסימן יוסף. ע"י ג"כ הדאר כך ט"ז גליון עשרה (ג' שבט תרצ"ז) עמ' 162–163.

660. ויהי הכל במאמר ראשון ואחרון. — *חורב ב' 11.
661. . . . ויעל האיש אלקנה ויעש חג סידורו. — יוצר לר"ה-ס' תשר"ק (נשאר רק ו', ה', ד', ג', ב', א'). *גנזי שירה 93.
662. וירא אוהלי משולי בבת עיין. — ח"ו מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו-ס' א"ב. *ידיעות המכון ב' 259.
663. וירט אהובים ויאמל ואבה לאררם. — ח"ו (1) מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו-ס' א"ב (מרבע). *ידיעות המכון ב' 261.
664. וכוס שהם אשר יינו יגוני לב אנוש ישמיד. — (רמב"ע). *רמב"ע-דיואן 126.
665. . . . ולשני חדשים תבואתם ובן יומו נטע מליאתם. — פיוט נוסד על יחזקאל ל"ד-ס' א"ב (נשאר רק ו'-ע'). *גנזי שירה 116.
666. ומה לי בחנות בינות פראים. — (רמב"ע). *רמב"ע-דיואן 221.
667. ומה קלשון זהב. — (ר"א הכבלי). *דיואן ר"א הכבלי 232 (רק בית אחד).
668. ונהר נהרו מימי פלגיו. — (רמב"ע). *רמב"ע-דיואן 233.
669. ועמך תמוך בחסד ואליהם שובה. — חלק מקדושה-ס' תשר"ק, שלמה (המזל' מיחסו בטעות לקליר). *חורב ב' 15.
670. . . . ועצה נטל מאמון אשר אצלו יושבת. — ס' א"ב (נשאר רק מן ו' עד פ'-כל אות שש פעמים). *גנזי שירה 120.
671. וצאן לא יחזה דבר אשר יחזה רעה. — (רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר). *קובץ על יד, י"א 72.
672. . . . וקדם האכיל פי פת חסדיו. — (רמב"ע). *רמב"ע-דיואן 231.

673. ושמעו עובדי האל חכמיו והבינו במרכבת הדומיו. *בערנהיימער-
רשימת כ"י אמברויאנא 70.
- זותמצא ירך אל אויביך. —סופו של השיר: לאברהם אשר פניו מאורים (אוה"ש
אות ל סי' 111) מובא במאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 278.
- זבולי שים כולי בנבולי שים יה (17). —פ*—יא 212.
674. זה באמת יעצר בעד עמו. —שריד מפיט. [ר"א הבבלי.] *מאנן-טעקסט
ח"א 298; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 318.
675. זה השער אשר איום ייסד ביסודות הגן. —לנעילה-סי' א"ב [קליר 1].
*גנוי שירה 20; חורב א' 167.
676. זיו פניו ימה עם פני פרו. —שריד מקרובה-סי' א"ב כפול (אותיות א'-ו' חסרות
ואות ת'ו כפולה שמונה פעמים). *עדעלמן 14.
677. זכרו לטוב אליהו הנביא. —סי' א"ב. *רשימה-שירמן 79.
678. זכרתיך על יצועי באשמורות אהגה בך. —פ*—יא 119.
679. זמן החן אשר זרע במצחק. —[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר-שירמן 226.
680. זמן הישועה קרב נא צרור המור. —סי' זרחיה. *פ*—יא 175.
681. זמן הרע מצאתיהו כאויב ולא יחון עלי כל דל ומסכן. —[נחמים
קלעי.] *כתאב ורוד ח"ב 21.
- זמן יקרא עדיו (224). —*רמב"ע-דיואן 161.
682. זמן פרש בעד תבל מצודיו. —קינה על ראש הישיבה יצחק הכהן בן אלאואני-
[ר"א הבבלי] *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 298 (רק קטע נשאר ממנו); דיואן ר"א הבבלי 317.
683. זמנים נתנו ארבעם בקרבעם. —[ר"א הבבלי.] *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 303
(רק ההתחלה).
684. זעום פנים בשורך תשטמני. —[סעדיה לגנון] *זואת ליהודה 65.
685. זעומי אל ומניאל חברם ועוזריהם. —[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר-
שירמן 233.
686. . . . זקנים וזקנות ועוללים ויונקים. . . —שריד מקרובה לשבת כי תצא-
סי' מ'-ת', אלעזר חזק (כפול). *גנוי שירה 44.
687. חולת אהבים לילה בכו תבכה. —[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע-דיואן 83.

688. חון אל דלים מגוי זה נרגן הואל לידי בלבול. —פ*—יא 22.
689. חושה לעזרתי עשה בקשתי. —פ*—יא 142.
690. חותם תכנית חכמה מלא. —שיר בראש מכתב ששלח יוסף בן מרדכי הטרוקי לאליהו בשיצ'—סי' יוסף. *מאנ—טעקסטס ח"ב 1149.
- חזה העט ביד השר (162). —רמב"ע—דיואן 196.
- חזקו עלי כל דבריהם (189). —רמב"ע—דיואן 213.
691. חי ה' אלהי עולם הוא ימציא לך תעל. —סי' חזק. אולי הוא סופו של הפיוט הקודם: מבורך שבת מפי. *תהלות לאל 3:
692. חי שעה קול ניב דל ואביון. —פ*—יא 110.
693. חכם ועשה מעשה סכל מה טוב ומה בצע באמרתו. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 58.
694. . . חכם חכמי זמן השר סעדיה. —[ר"א הבבלי.] *דיואן ר"א הבבלי 192.
695. חכם לבב בבוא ביתך יבקש מקום תורה. —כ"ה לחי 14.
696. חמסי על זמן הרע בבגדו אשר בגד והפריד בין אהובים. —[יהודה בן יוסף ברסאני או כרסאני.] *בערנהיימער—רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 148; עי' ג"כ המזכיר י"ב 104—105.
697. חמסי על ילדים יאמרו כי בתפוחי אהבים רפדוני. —[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע—דיואן 41.
698. חנוכת אהל אהליבה (ת)איר. —פיוט לחנוכה. סי' א"ב (מניע רק עד אות ט'). *עדעלמן 29.
699. חנון רחום יאמר אמר. —סי' חינו' חזק. *רשימה—שירמן 81.
700. חסד ואמת נפגשו על מימינו. —שיר על הרמב"ם. *מלאכת השיר 64 ושם נתערב בשיר המתחיל: קורא בספר זה; עי' החלוצ' ח' 138.
701. חסד גמול וחמל עלי דכא. —[שלמה בנפיד.] *כ"ה לחי 15.
702. חסדי ה' אזכירה כי גמר בעדי. —סי' חיים חזק. *פ—יא 140.
703. חפצי שללו ימים ובידי בניהם נתנו אותי משסה. —[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע—דיואן 167.
704. . . חצי זקני וזקני סולפתי בארם. —סופה של קרובה לפורים—סי' ס'—ח'. פינחס. *גנוי שירה 79.

705. חרב בפי כל איש כסיל שומה.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ
על יד, י"א 65.
706. חרפת בני אדם לבל תשמע.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ
על יד, י"א 63; כה לחי 16.
707. ... חשות ובאות וכמעט נפשות דאות.—קטע מפיוט—[המחל מיחסי
לרשב"ג על ספר החתימה, שלום לרוב' שנמצא בכ"י בסוף הקטע, אבל החתימה הזאת
שייך לפיוט "אז בהר המור" ולפי זה זהותו של הפיוט מוטל בספק]. *פיוטים
ספרדיים. 5.
708. חשק ביום בנה על כל בני פרחא מצור.—[סעדיה לונגו.] *חאת
ליהודה 66.
709. חשק צבי החן בלה בשרי.—[טררוס אבואלעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון 16.
710. חתן בראשית שיזכה לקרא בתורה ראשית.—ס' חתן בראשית.
*פ-יא 140.
711. חתן וכלתך אדון עולם יצו לכם ברכות ממרומי ערץ.—[רמב"ע.]
*רמב"ע-דיואן 217.
712. חתן יהי ביתך כבית פרץ יליד תמר.—[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע-דיואן 65.
713. חתן תורה שיזכה לקרא בתורה הוא יזכה בטובה.—ס' חתן תורה
חזק. *פ-יא 139.
714. טוב אל ה' עליון דבר נא זמני והודי.—*פ-יא 160.
715. טוב לשבת על פינת התורה ובמעיינותיה אשאף.—שיר נוסד על
משנה אבות פ"א, ב'. [אפרים בן אהרן לונטשיץ]. *עיר גבורים 12.
716. יאור במאפליה אדם בספיר.—[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע-דיואן 261.
יבוס בנה יבוש שונא (113).—*ספר היובל לפרופיסר קרויס 197.
717. יבושן כל עובדי פסל מתהללים באילים אני באל אשים
כסל.—ס' יוסף. *פ-יא 81.
718. יבושו עמים יחפרו לאומים.—ח"ג מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו—ס' יניי.
*ידיעות המכון ב' 257.
719. יבין שמע כל איש דמע.—[יששכר שמחה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 108.
720. יביע פי שיר ורגנה יג' יונדוס רבוס סאנה.—עברית ואיספניולית—
ס' יעקב בנויטשתי חזק. *פ-יא 109.

721. יברך צור אשר ירחיק קרבים. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 241.
יד נכשלה נחשלה ממעלי (294). *ספר היובל לקרוים 202.
ידאה לבבי יאבר אל שמי תקוה (304). *ספר היובל לקרוים 198.
722. ידבר פי דבר אמת לאיש חשוב כמו רמש. — [יששכר שמחה].
*ידיעות המכון ב' 98.
ידודן ידודן שנת מעיני (323). *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 509.
723. ידע תדע פני צאנך אשר הגלום צרים. — פומון-סי' יהודה [רי"ה].
*רי"ה-בראדרי ח"ד 255.
ידור עמי הדור (338). *מחקרים 72.
ידי אליך פרשתי (341). *ספר היובל לקרוים 200.
ידיד לב סורה אלי בתי (395). *הארץ גליון 4509 (ד' סיון תרצ"ד).
724. ידיד צור גואלי חיש ושובור עולי. — סי' יעקב. *פ-יא 187.
ידיד שוב עמי למה תהיה כנר (443). *מחקרים 65.
725. ידידותם כברק או בתבל נחזה כחלום. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-
דיואן 108.
ידידי אמור לנדודי (482). *ספר היובל לקרוים 201.
726. ידידי את ביום ענה תענה. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 85.
727. ידידי הזמן חדש וחיו כהיום אחרי מות הערגות. — [רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 34.
728. ידידי יה שבטי יה יהללו את שם י"י. — אופן סי' יעקב [ר"ת ?]. *פיוטים
ספרדיים 12.
ידידך כטל יול ששונם (570). *ידיעות המכון ב' 11.
ידך בעורף אויביך שים (614). *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 504.
729. ידמוה אלי סהר ואמר לסהר. — מן מקאמת טוביה-המו'ל מיחסו לר"י
חריו, וצ"ע. *חורב א' 184.
730. ידעת עלמה צפוני לבבי. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 18.
ידעתי אל כי כל תוכל (656). *ספר היובל לקרוים 204.

731. יה אל הנה עבדך חנני. . . יהים לבבי על חטאתי.—ס' יהודה בן דוד יחיה. *רשימה-שירמן 90.
732. יה אלה דר רומה ושוכן שמימה.—ס' יעקב. *פ-יא 65.
- יה אראה אור צר כי יהל (775).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 513.
- יה את פניך אבקש צורי (785).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 504.
733. יה בהר כונן זבולי והושיעני מיד אויבי.—*פ-יא 202.
- יה גואל אתה לי (810).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 508; ספר היובל לקרויס 204.
734. יה השב אל המור עדת ממנה [צ"ל סי מנה].—ס' יצחק. *פ-יא 135; צ. 555.
- יה זרועי אמצנו (869).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 505.
735. יה ירדו דלים בין.—*רשימה-שירמן 88.
736. יה ישועתך תחיש נא לגולה.—ס' יעקב [אבן צור]. *עת לכל חפץ 17.
737. יה לדל ענה שעה וגם פנה.—ס' יהודה. *רשימה-שירמן 89.
738. יה לי בהר הדרת גילי.—*פ-יא 125.
739. יה ליעפים יצאו רחופים.—ס' יהודה [אבן ג'את]. *יריעות המכון 190; צ. 215 הע' 1.
740. יה למדוה לבבי תן מרפא.—ס' רפאל משה אלבאז. *שיר חדש-ה' 28; יהגה לבבי הגות תבונות (1177).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 513.
- יהגה לך חכי שיר חדש (1178).—*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 509.
741. יהגה לשוני גדולות נגד עניות ודלות.—[יששכר שמחה]. *יריעות המכון ב' 102.
742. יהי חסדך עלינו אלהינו.—ס' יואל גאלה (1). *רשימה-שירמן 93.
743. יהי נא חסדך לנחמני אערוך נגדך שתחונני.—ס' יוסף. *פ-יא 209.
744. יר"מ אאו"א אב הרחמים אדון הסליחות שאם נגזר עלינו.—*צמח צדיק-ליוורנו 92.
745. יהי שלום גדול אורך ימים טובות.—[לחופה-ס' א"ב]. *חופת חתנים-קונין 44, 48.

746. יהלל איש לפי שכלו ויבזהו לפי סכלו. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר].
*קובץ על יד, י"א 72.
747. יהלל לאלו חיי יהלל בעודי חי. — סי' יוסף חוק. *פ-יא 141.
748. יהמה לבי עם רב כאבי. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 111.
749. יודו לך ראש אגמון כפה. — סי' רפאל [משה אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה 25.
יודו לשמך עליון (1526). *מבחר-שירמן 103.
750. יודו צבא מרום כולם שם אל חי בקדש דר. *פ-יא 101.
יודע ועד הוד פניך נחלה (1549) — סי' יואב חוק, יואב ברבי דניאל. *מבחר-שירמן 133.
751. יום אהוב הוא אשר יקנאו בו כל ימי שנה. — פיוט ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב.
*ארמן 28.
752. יום אחד אשר ימים יוצרו והוא לכך נוצר. — פיוט ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב.
*ארמן 29.
753. יום אליהו הנביא יבוא. — סי' דנין אל [?]. *רשימה-שירמן 95.
754. יום אלפי רבבה תשובב באלף המגן. — פיוט ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב, נכל אות
ד' פעמים, אותיות ע'—ח' חסרות]. *ארמן 31.
755. יום אמר אדון העולם אל משה ידידו. — סי' יוסף. *חקופתנו 466.
756. יום אף כעס תפר. — פיוט ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב. *עדעלמן 12.
757. יום בא לאמים עם קהל עמים. — [משה בן יואב]. *מבחר-שירמן 238.
758. יום בו נפקד יעקב אז קול כנורי אל אבל הומר. — [רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 135.
759. יום הנדוד המר והנמהר אותי ביין התאוה השכיר. — [רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 101.
760. יום זה בשורה כי שמואל אל עמו לנביא נאמן צופה. — שיר בשבח
הספר. [מאיר חיים יצחקי]. *יפה תאר 1657 (בהקדמה דף ב' ע"ב).
761. יום יהיה מטר עלי ארץ. — סי' יהודה (בן זרובבל). *מאנן-טעקסט
ח"ב 1195.
762. יום יום אקום להודות ולזמר לאל בשחר. — סי' יעקב. *רשימה-
שירמן 96.

763. יום יום ידרשון לאל בתחינה ובקשה. —פ*—יא 215.
764. יום כשחרים נשקפו חברים. —סי' יהודה גיאת. *ידיעות המכון ב' 191.
765. יום מעלות אישים להמליך מלך אוו. —[מנחם די לונזאנו]. שתי* ידות 149.
766. יום שעלה רוח משה בן רב מיימון להיכלו. —שיר לכבוד הרמב"ם. *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ב 171.
767. יום תת לדל כלי שרוך נעל. —[מנחם די לונזאנו]. *דרך חיים-לונזאנו עמ' xxx; שתי ידות 149.
768. יומם ולילה תעמול להיות חכם. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, יא 57.
769. יונה את קולך שמעתי בשירה. —סי' יוסף. *פ—יא 210.
770. יונה בצל לבב צבי דבקך. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 247.
- יונה העלי אבר (2012). —*מחקרים 76.
- יונה עצורה תוך פה קשורה (2062). —*הדאר שנה י"ג גליון כ"ט (כ"ח סיון תרצ"ד).
- יונה תכסוף אל צירה (2070). —*צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 506.
771. יוסף לקח מכל מרקח אותי יקח בשפת יתר. —[יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 107.
772. יוצר את האדם בחכמה שבחיו למעלה רמו. —[רפאל משה אלכאז]. *שיר-חדש-ה' 26.
773. יוצר בני אדם ושיחותם. —סי' יוסף [אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 172.
774. יוצר הרים ובורא רוח מצוי בכל עת. —סי' יוסף חזק. *פ—יא 79.
- יושבי בטח אל תריכוני (2370). —*רמב"ע-דיואן 254.
775. יושבי חשך וצלמות אסירי תקותך. —תחנה-סי' יהודה. *תקופתנו 454.
776. יושבת במאסר ובמחסור אל תרגזי עוד. —סי' יוסף [אבן ברזל]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 178.
- יושיע ציון יבנה עליון (2391). —*ספר היובל לקרוים 205.
777. יזלו פועל ביום חילך. —חלק ששי מן תפלת טל שלפי הנראה נוסדה על ישעיה מ"ה ח': „הרעיפו שמים ממעל ושחקים יזלו צדק". [נקליר ?] *עדעלמן 2.

778. יזם ממית ומחיה לזרע כה יהיה.—ח'ג מן הקרובה: אחריו המשכחה קהלים—סי' יהודה. *וולאי 33.
779. יחי מלך לעד ימלוך דבר יאזין וגם אמר.—[יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 101.
780. יחיד אלי צור גואלי תשמע קולי.—*חפץ חיים (הללות סי' א').
781. יחיד הדור זכרתיך ידידי.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 43.
782. יחיד מרומם בורא גויה חוסה ורחם על אום עניה.—סי' אברהם [ראב"ע ?]. *חורב ב' 252.
783. יחידה בעבודת אל תני חשקך.—[שמואל אריפול]. *יובח תורה—קושטא 6; מזמור לתורה ד'ו 1576 עמ' 5.
784. יחידה דעי צורך באתות פעלותיו.—שיר פילוסופי על היחוד [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 79.
785. יחל ישראל אל רם ונשא.—פ—יא 144.
786. יחרד לבי ויתר מחמד עיני הנסתר.—פ—יא 40.
787. יין בעת נכנס אזי יצא סוד.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, יא 59.
788. יכונן וישים תהלה ירושלים עיר ההוללה.—סי' יוסף בולי. *פ—יא 23.
789. ילדה מתארת באצבע יה את מעשה מרן דבשמיא.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר—שירמן 228.
790. ילדי זממי ממצוא שברם בושו.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 23.
791. יליד המור צרור המור לרע שמור וגם לפוגה.—[יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 102.
792. יליד ירח אביב בא בבד"ו.—כללי רחיות ניסן—סי' יעקב בירבי שמשון. *החקופה ט"ז 234.
- ימותי חלפו צפות לדרך (2896).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 75.
793. ימי זקנה מעט מזער ורעים מלאים.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר—שירמן 227.
794. ימי רעה באו והגיעו שנים בחיל פחים.—[סעדיה לוננו]. *וואת ליהודה 68.

795. ימים אמונים עד שאול יורידו.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 22.
796. ימים ולילות יקונן לבבי.—[משה בן יואב]. *מבחר—שירמן 236.
797. ימימה עת צבא צבאות בנות חן.—מן מקאמה טוביה—[המ"ל מיחסו לר"י חריו"י, וצ"ע]. *חורב א' 185; ספר זכרון א"ר 95 [מנוסח עפ"י כ"י מוטעה: תפתי לבבי בניבך, ומיוחס שם לר' אברהם בן שמואל הלוי בן חסדאי בצ"ע].
798. ימימה תפתי בניבך לבבי.—מן מקאמת טוביה. [המ"ל מיחסו לר"י חריו"י, וצ"ע]. *חורב א' 185; ספר זכרון א"ר 95 [מנוסח עפ"י כ"י מוטעה: תפתי לבבי בניבך, ומיוחס שם לר' אברהם בן שמואל הלוי בן חסדאי בצ"ע].
799. ימין עליון יחבקני יום אקרא מהר ענני.—סי' יוסף בולי. *פ—יא 22.
800. ימיני עם עצמה בבין ככבי רומה.—[סעדיה לונגו]. *זוהר ליהודה 69.
801. ימלוך איום ונורא אלהיך בקרבך איומה.—[לויכ"פ—סי' א"ב]. *גנוי שירה 73.
- ימלט אי—נקי ארץ צבי חשקי (3003).—*ספר היוכל לקרוים 195.
802. ימשול בן קל בי יום זד נבל.—סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש—ה' 29.
- ינום גבר ישן גבר (3038).—*צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ד 512.
803. ינחם אל לבב איש בין שמואל.—שיר תנחומים [ר"א הבבלי]. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"א 278; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 309.
804. יסד יסוד מיסד רב ורהב.—סי' יוחנן יהודה אלטרינו חזק. *מבחר—שירמן 258.
- יסדת עז על לשוני (3066).—*צינבערג—געשיכטע ח"ד 505.
805. יסוד דעה למוד עובר ושובה.—בתים בנויים על ספרי הרמב"ם. *רבעון האנגלי (מ"ח) כ"ה 437.
806. יסודות התורה בעזרת אל נורא.—[אחיטוב הרופא מפלרמו]. *ידיעות המכון 146.
807. יסכר פי דוברי שקר בו רב דופי עד אין חקר.—[יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 105.
808. יעירוני רעיוני משנתי ערבה.—סי' יעקב (ב' פעמים) טרפון חזק. *אלמה א' 103.
- יעלה ארוכה צור למכת יעלה (3156).—*ידיעות המכון ב' 174.

809. יעלה מתקשטת חלתה פני. — [סעדיה לוגנו]. *זואת ליהודה 66.
810. יעלה יפה תמה אורה כאור החמה. — [המל' מיחסו לראב"ע]. *תרביץ ה', 63.
811. יעלה נא יהודה גביר התעודה. — *רשימה-שירמן 101.
812. יעלת אהבים תענני. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 91.
813. יעלת חן חנה שם בלב מעוניה. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 42.
814. יעקב איומתו מכל אום בחירה בכך במעשיה בכל הארצות נתפזרה. — מעמדות ליוכ"פ-סי' א"ב. *כפא-כ"י 106.
815. יעקב איילתו בכח מלאכי אל. — מעמד למוסף יוכ"פ-סי' א"ב. *כפא-כ"י 111.
816. יעקב איש תם עליו נרתם ברכות הרב. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 100.
- יערבו לפניך דלים (3288). — סי' א'—ט'. *פיוטים ספרדיים 11.
- יערה עלינו רוח מרום ותוננו כימי קדם (3291). — *פ-יא 41.
817. יערף לקחי מפי כמטר. — מחרך-סי' יהודה [רי"ה]. *רי"ה-בראדי ח"ד 182. הערה: מ. ווילענסקי בירחון ע"ו 611 חושב שזה רק חלק ב' מן הפיוט „יקרה מיקר ויצרך” (3665).
818. יעשה שרש מני פורש כאשר חורש על גב תבן. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 106.
819. יפה אורי כמו הצרי לראש חרי ושר פלך. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 114.
820. יפה בעיתו את הכל עשה על כל אלהים הוא רם ונשא. — סי' יוסף. *פ-יא 38.
- יפה דוד לך אשא עיני (3321). — *פ-יא 166 (רק סי' ישראל); ספר היובל לקרויס 205 (מנסח: לך אשא ידי).
821. יפה שתיקה ודמימות פה. — ח"ג מן הקרובה: אלפתה לעם חשוּקִיךָ. *זולאי 29.
822. יפו מאד פניו עדי דבר. — מן מקאמת טוביה [המל' מיחסו לר"י חריזי, וצ"ע]. *חורב א' 183.

823. יפית ונעמת נטר שריגים. — *רשימה-שירמן 103.
- יפליא חסדו לי דוד (3407). — *ספר היובל לקרויס 206.
- יפעתך חמה מביש המה (3419). — *מחקרים 80.
824. יפצחו לפניכם רינה הר וגבעה טמונה. — *פ-יא 194.
- יפת חן לבבתיני (3441). — *מחקרים 82.
825. יפתח לך אפריון יושב בסתר עליון. — פיוט להלוית המת ניצחק בן יעקב מן הלויים. *קנת סופדים 3.
826. יצא אב-הם הוא אברהם אויביו נלחם תוך הלילה. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 114.
827. יצא חוטר אותי נוטר. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 110.
828. יצא לבבי בחזות יעקב מת. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 97.
829. יצא נפש בלי נפש יחזור רפש ברוב אשמה. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 103.
830. יצו אל ברכת שמים ותפרח ארץ לא זרועה. — הברלה-סי' מאיר [הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 78.
- יצפר נהר להר נלעד (3547). — *מחקרים 71.
831. יצר הרע ראשו פרע לבל כרע רע מנעוריו. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 109.
832. יצר סמוך אשר נואל לבטלו מאל תשאל. — סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 25.
833. יצרתני ברוח בין יתרה. — סי' יוסף [אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 174.
834. יקד יקד כיקוד אש בי עת אראה אמה ארורה. — סי' יהודה אלפאקי בן משה. *קרית ספר י"ב 521; רשימה-שירמן 105.
835. יקח שכל כל איש רוכל. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 112.
836. יקר ועז לכל משכיל בשכלו. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 54.
837. יקר יתנו לשמך כל העמים ועמך. — סי' יוסף. *פ-יא 200.

838. יקר שירי עם רב אורי יאיר נרי בכל זמן. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 113.
- יקשיח לב צר (3685). — *ספר היובל לקרוים 207.
- ירא האל ירא גבר מיאש (3720). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 58.
- ירא מיום אשר נורא ואיום (3733). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 174.
839. ירא משנאך פעם והבן ומאהבך אלף פעמים. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 51.
- יראו וקמו מלכים (3746). — *מחקרים 77.
840. ירד כמטר על גו הגיון עצרת כמהים. — פיוט לגשם. ס' יהודה חזק. *מחקרים 165.
- ירוחם יתום אביו חי (3820). — *מחקרים 75.
841. ירוחם עני בלי דעה ולא ימצא דבר רעה. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 99.
842. יריבוני על עוזבי תורתי בצאתי מדבר צדק לעולה. — *פ-יא 42.
- יריבי בעדי ירב אמריו (3893). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 214.
- יריבי ריב והפל שן צר (3894). — *מחקרים 65.
843. ירעני זמן לא בן לרעי. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 125.
844. יש בזמן משיג במקרה. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 79.
845. יש . . . הדר . . . ענו מאד. — שיר על הרמב"ם. *רבעון האנגלי (מ"ח) כ"ה 405.
- ישא איש עינו לשמי רום (3956). — *מחקרים 85.
846. ישביעך יבול שמינה ויעשה רצונך בכל עת ועונה. — ח"ג מן הקדושתא: 'אם ישמעו לי שבטי חיילים'—ס' יהודה. *זולאי 73.
847. ישורר שירה פי וגם רינה. — ס' יעקב. *פ-יא 188.
848. ישים אל ממעונו שלום על ישראל עמו. — *פ-יא 205.
849. ישמה ויבטח רצוי אל. — [מנחם די לונזאנן]. *שתי ידות 149.

850. ישנה את אני נעור ונורד ומתנמנם. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.]. *מבחר-
שירמן 224.
851. ישעך ה' הראה ה' הראה אל משפיל לכל גאה. — סי' יהודה.
*פ-יא 80.
- ישעך לבבי דורש (4189). — *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 505.
852. ישתבח יוצרי כי גדול חסדך עד השמים. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר
המוסר.]. *קובץ על יד, יא 68.
853. יתברך וישתבח שם אלהינו לעלמי עלמיא. — שיר בסוף ספר זוהר
(כ"י) [משה בן ירמיה]. *לעווי-דשמיה 92.
854. יתברך שם אל הנורא כי נתן אל ידנו אל לתת תכלה אל
המחזור. — *רומא ב' (בסוף הספר).
855. יתיחד שמך במיחדי שמך. — ח"ג מן הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך. סי' יניי
*פיוטי יניי 7.
856. יתמה משכיל בזמן סכל גם יבהל בו סרעפּו. — [רמב"ע.]. *רמב"ע-
דיואן 182.
- יתנשא כארי יקום כלביא (4352). — *הארץ גליון 4509 (ד' סיון תרצ"ד).
857. כאהל מתחתה ותקרה נטויה עלי פנות ארבעה. — חלק מקרובה-
סי' את"בש. *גנוי שירה 81.
858. כבד מולידך מיגיע כפיך. — חלק מן קרובה לשבועות-סי' א"ב (כל אות
ב' פעמים ונשאר רק מן הוי"ד השניה עד תי"ו) [קליר]. *גנוי שירה 25.
859. כבודו איהל בכיתי גודו במנחת הערב. — חלק מקדושה למנחת יוכ"פ-
סי' א"ב. *גנוי שירה 107.
- כבודו מלא רום ושלש שלישי (77). — סי' מנחם המכונה קוריצי יחי ויגדל בתורה ובמעשים
טובים אמן ואמן. *ידיעות המכון א' 117.
860. כהיום הזה בירושלים ירבו שמחות בישראל. — *רשימה-שירמן 110.
861. כוכב כאשר אתה אמר אכן כסה אורו אפל. — [רמב"ע.]. *רמב"ע-
דיואן 186.
- כוכבי זקונים מלחיי דרכו (146). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 99.
862. כוכבי תהלות ברקיעים זרחו ודמי ענבים גוביעים קרחו. —
[ר"א הבבלי.]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 295; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 312.

863. כוכבי תהלות מזבול זרחו היום ושושני יקר פרחו. —[ר"א הבבלי].
*מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 205; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 311.
864. כוס ועפרה ושתות בנן. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 57.
865. כוס מר מרה כוס תרעלה. —ס' מאברה [אברהם]. *פ-יא 159.
כוסי בבר פתי בבר (160). —*חורב ג' 12.
866. כושית אשר עורה לעד עליה. —[אברהם בן שבתי הכהן]. *מבחר-
שירמן 358.
867. ... כי שכחתי מאכול לחמי. —קרובה-ס' [שמואל ה'] שלישי בחבורה,
א"ב [נפול, אלא שאותיות א'-ו' חסרות ואותיות צ'-ת' באות רק פעם אחת וכלן בבית
האחרון]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 165.
868. כי תשאלו לאיש שובב במעשיו ובמקומו. —ס' רפאל משה [אלבאן].
*שיר חדש-ה' 32.
869. כילי אני קרא לו גבעוני גם נעליו. —[יעקב בן יצחק סגרי]. *מבחר-
שירמן 264.
- כוכבים אנחנו על אדמה (240). —*חורב א' 184 [המיל מיחסו לר"י חרין, וצ"ע].
870. כל איש דוה לבב ומר צרת. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 1.
871. כל האנוש לפי שכלו ימלט דל מגזלו. —[תוכחה]. *פיוטים ספרדיים 17.
872. כל הנשים הן פח מוקשים. —[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת ליהודה 65.
873. כל טוב והון אל מוסר מקבל. —[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
- כל מדברי תבל לבניה כזב (342). *רמב"ע-דיואן 44.
874. כלה דברך בכור מות. —[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת ליהודה 67.
875. כמה אני סעד לבבי עד ישקט מעט. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 189.
876. כמה בשרי אל מתי חכמה. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ
על יד, י"א 48.
877. כמו כדור כעורה תצנפני. —[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת ליהודה 66.
878. כנפי נשרים הם ודבריהם אמת. —[עמנואל בן יעקב]. *בערנהיימער-
רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 152.
879. כסיל יגאה במשפחתו דעה די בהתיחס אנוש אל אם ואל אב. —
[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 55.

880. כסיל ימר דבש חכמה לחכו.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ
על יד, י"א 57.
881. כסיל ירום בזכרו משפחתיו.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ
על יד, י"א 55. כתאב ורוד ח"א 24.
882. כסיל על אהבת עפרה מריבי.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות
המכון 67.
883. כפיר מדע אשר יעיר לבבו.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 27.
כרה בור ויחפרהו (630).—*מחקרים 71.
- כרוב ממשח אשר שחק דבירך (532).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 215.
884. כתבתיהו והמזרק בידי ועפר הזמן נגן ומשקה.—[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע—דיואן 198.
- לא הזמן דמה להעתיקנו (35).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 201.
885. לא נשארו מתענוגים רק דברי מתי חכמה וחידותם.—[רש"ט
פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 68.
886. . . לא תמשוך אפך על עמך בדור ודור בעצבו.—ס' א"ב (מחזיק
רק מ'ח'). *גנני שירה 105.
887. לא תרצח ותחגר בחרב.—חלק מן קרובה לשבועות ס' תשר"ק וכל אות
ב' פעמים, רק אותיות ת', ש' נשארו. [קליר]. *גנני שירה 26.
888. לאט ללב אשר רגזו ופחד למקרה הזמן הרע וילדו.—רמב"ע.
*רמב"ע—דיואן 39.
889. לאסיא אוקיר עד דלא תצטרך ליה.—(מנחם די לונזאנו). *שתי
ידות 149.
890. לב חכם ישכיל פיהו אי מזה ואיזה הוא.—ס' רפאל משה אלבאן.
*שיר חדש—ה' 35.
891. לבבי האדיב יגון בשרו ונחל הבכי קרע סגורו.—[מאיר הלוי
אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 59.
892. לבבי על דבר כילי לעולם אל תהי נסמך.—*כה לחי 17.
893. לבי הולך וימלך לאמר לי לך לקראת משה.—שיר לכבוד הרמב"ם.
*רבעון האנגלי [מ"ח] כ"ה 399.

894. לבי יזעק למו אב ומי יגונות אשאב. — קינה על יהודה אלבאו-סי' רפאל משה [אלבאו]. *שיר חדש-ה' 59.
- לבי לאישים כליל עד אין סוף (368). — *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ד 507.
- לבי לעלמה צפונה יעוף כמו יונה (*23). — *תקופתנו 463.
895. לבי עבד אל התוגות ולילדי יום היום נמכר. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 53.
- לבנת הספיר אורך יחפיר (446). — *הדאר שנה י"ג גליון כ"ט (כ"ה סיון תרצ"ד).
896. לגבר שלחה ידו ברכה יצו אל באסמיו הברכה. — [ראב"ע ? תרביץ ה' 64].
897. להודות אל בתוך קהל ועדה אשורר שיר ואפתח פי בתודה. — משה הגולה מקיעו]. *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ה 349.
- לו אור קדושי יתחדש (535). — *ידיעות המכון ב' 170.
898. לו חכמו אישים ולו יבינו צדה לדרכם בזמן יכינו. — [שלמה בונפיד]. כה לחי 18.
- לו יחזו שירי ולו יבחינו בין טוב לרע (557). — [עמנואל פראנשים]. *מבחר-שירמן 317.
- לו שמי נייר אין די לכתבהו (577). — *מחקרים 86.
899. לולי ידעתיך אהבה מאמש לולי בידי. — [יעקב בן דוד פראנשים]. *מבחר-שירמן 276.
900. לולי כי סוד האל נעלם מכל. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 166.
- לומר לשמך עליון קדמה ימה נצא (620). — *פ-יא 143.
- †לחברת תמימים צור עולמים. — עי' יום כשחרים נשקפו חברים.
901. ... לחשיכים פ ... כאומנ ... ישמע. — שריר מן שמונה עשרה לחנוכה. *עדעלמן 29.
902. לי הוגד חזות קשה מעי אוחילה. — קינה על אחותו-סי' רפאל [משה אלבאו]. *שיר חדש-ה' 67.
903. לי יאות למיבכי ולמיחם הספדא. — קינה על עמרם אלבאו-סי' רפאל [משה אלבאו]. *שיר חדש-ה' 63.
904. לי יאמרו רעי ולי ישאלו. — [משה בן יואב]. *מבחר-שירמן 239.
- לי רננה צפור וכמבשרת (686). — *ספר היובל לקרוים 189.

905. ליל מחשבות לב אעירה ונדר אהובים אוכירה.—[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע—דיואן 258.
906. ליל שמורים. . . כי בו נגלה בחצי הלילה.—מעריב לפסח—רק ג'—ח'
מן הא"ב נשארו. *גנוי שירה 123.
- לילה ויום לך מביעים זמר.—עי' איש' תם בטוב אסמטה.
907. לך הרב למישור כל רכסים.—שיר לכבוד הרמב"ם. *רבעון האנגלי
(מ"ח) כ"ה 399.
908. לך השר לך חן חן תשואה וכפך לחלי עני רפואה.—[ר"א הבבלי].
*דיואן ר"א הבבלי 226.
909. לך ידיד נאמן תפארת הזמן אביעה חידות מריבת יום ולילה.—
וכוח בין היום והלילה—סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש—ה' 33.
910. לך ליל תהלתי לך נאווה תהלה.—קדוש לליל שבת—סי' למאיר [הלוי
אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 74.
911. לך לך לאומרים כי הזמן יכלה ויתם.—[רשב"ג]. *לקט שירים 23.
912. לך לשלום למקומך.—*רשימה—שירמן 113.
913. לך מבין רעיוני אשר בהגיוני.—סי' שמואל בן מי[מון] חזק. *תהלות
לא 9.
914. . . . לך מראה אש בית לה סביב.—שריד מפיוט—סי' א"ב [נשאר רק מן מ'
עד ת']. *עדעלמן 19.
915. לך עוז יאדירו ארבעה דמיונות איומי מוראים.—ליוב"פ—רק א'—ו'
מן סי' הא"ב נשארו בראשי הבתים ובסופיהם. *גנוי שירה 103.
916. לך שר מרדכי כסא שררה.—[ר"א הבבלי]. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"א 297.
דיואן ר"א הבבלי 315.
- לכסיל אשר כסלו בהון תבל נתן (1001).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 178.
917. למה בחיי לא אהי כילי.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על
יד, י"א 49.
918. למה עדי זהב יסבב גבר.—שיר בשבח השר ברטולומיא ואלויר די גאנדיאה.
[שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *תרביץ ח' 64.
- למה עלי שכמי יביאון סלת (*61).—[שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *תרביץ ח' 66.

919. למי אחפוץ לעשות יקר. — שיר לחפת חתנים — [רי"א מדינה]. *השירים אשר לשלמה; עלים ח"א 104.
- †למען תפר עלה תאנה [נני שירה 126]. עי' למען תקיף אלהי קדם מעונה.
920. למראה איש ולמלבושי ולדבר שפתיו. — [מנחם די לונאנו]. *דרך חיים — לונאנו עמ' xxx; שתי ידות 149 [נרשום עליו: "גם אלה משלי מנחם"]; כה לחי 19 [מחסו לרחמים קלעי ממשוררי מצרים].
921. למשופטי אתחנן ולפועלי אתן צדק. — תפלה בנויה על סדר שמנה עשרה. *הברמן — תפלות 5.
922. לנדוד מי בכי בעיני. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 54.
923. לנדוד יעלת חשקי סמר בשרי ומאורי קדר. — סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 37.
924. לניצר אמונים הושיעה בך מאמינים. — שריד משמונה עשרה להושענא רבה. *עדעלמן 30.
925. לסגולת עדת תמימים ברית עולם אתן להם. — *רשימה-שירמן 115.
926. לספוד לצרה זאת הפעם אלוה. — קינה על אשת דודו ר' עמרם-סי' רפאל [משה אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 66.
927. לעד אומרה ואשיחה לאל נורא ושירה אפציחה. — סי' ליאון בר מיכאל הפרנס חוק. *רשימה-שירמן 116.
928. לעם נדח אנא ה' הושיעה נא. — *רשימה-שירמן 117.
929. לעפר אני נאסר לחייו דמות אור וצר. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 39.
930. לעקרה לא ילדה אל עליון גואל תביא. — סי' משה. *רשימה-שירמן 118.
931. לפני מעתיק מדת קונו עבד נרצע הוא מתבושש. — [שמואל ארקיוולטי]. *הרביץ ח' 65.
932. לפנים לנביא בשם רואה קראו. — [סעדיה לוננו]. *וואת ליהודה 65.
933. לפרודך ידיד לבי אהובי ששוני סר וגם גדל כאבי. — [משה בן שמואל צפתי]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"ב 243.
- ליך שירתי שעשיתי לכעוס אותי חשב לבזות (1321). — *חורב ג' 13.

934. לקראת דוד אשר זרח ובא מירושלים. — סי' אברהם [ראב"ע].
*תרביץ ח' 65.
935. לרב האי נתיב סודות להורות לאישים רעיוניהם נבוכים. — שיר
קטן מאת מעתיק תשובת ר' האי על ענין הישועה. *בית עקד האגדות מחברת א'
עמ' 17.
936. לשואלים עצת נערים וכסילים. — [יששכר שמחה]. *ידיעות המכון 99.
937. לשון דמעו יגלה סוד צפוננו. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 142.
938. לשונות למדו נהי וקינה. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 56.
939. לשכך חמתך ולכבש קינאתך. — חלק ח' מן הקרובה לסדר, פניחס בן
אלעזר. *ידיעות המכון ב' 263.
- לשם המיוחד מקורא באחד (1456). — *תרביץ ז' 339.
940. לשם יחוד קב"ה ושכינתיה. . . הריני מוכן לקיים מה שאמרה
תורה ושננתם לבניך. — תפלה למלמדי תינוקות [אליעזר פאפן]. *בית תפלה-
פאפן; מקורות לתולדות החנוך ח"ג 116.
941. לשמחת חתני רצוף אהבה-שמע נא חתני. *רשימה-שירמן 123.
942. מאגד ברכות הכלולות הוד. — ח"ו מן הקרובה איש תם בטוב אסמטה-סי'
א"ב. *ידיעות המכון ב' 226.
943. מאוד נעלה במטה שמים וארץ נטה. — *פ-יא 114.
- ‡מאד עזה כמות אהב. — ח"ב מן הקרובה: אחד אתה ומי ישיבך.
944. מאד קלה פרידתי עליהם. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 50.
945. מאהב ידי תרפינה ולפרוד עיני תבכינה. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-
דיואן 259.
- מאור היום לסודנו כרכיל (48). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 138.
946. מאור עינך וניצוציו חצצים. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-
שירמן 224.
947. מאורות על פני עפרה יאירון. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-
שירמן 227.
- מאס תבל ואל יום הפקודה בכל עת עינך תהיה מצפה (114). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 177.
- מבטל זמנו הוא מורד בקונו (149). — *עלים ב' 44.

948. מבינים ורעיונים גלויים וצפונים ראו מעין גנים ערוגיו שושנים.—
הקדמה לס' ארבעה קנינים (כ"י)—[יהודה בן שלמה קפנטן]. *לעווי-רשימה 112.
949. מבכי נהרות חבש ונתן מימיו בקומו.—קניה על מות בנכשת בן שלמה
ן' לביא. *ישרון ט' 9.
950. מגדל עוז שם דר במעונים.—ס"י יוסף. *פ-יא 188.
951. מגילה מגלה לעם אל סגלה.—שיר תודה—[מרדכי בר ברוך מטיולין].
*קרית ספר ח"י 496 (עפ"י מנות הלוי ד"ו שמה טופס אדלר).
952. מדור אלהא דמלקדמין אגן במימרח.—פיוט ארמי-ס' א"ב. *גנני
שירה 109.
953. מה בצע לי בקרא לי אב בן ממתיק לי את אמרותיו.—[רמב"ע].
*רמב"ע-דיואן 236.
954. מה דמות תערכו לאל משגיח.—ס' רפאל משה אלבאז אמין. *שיר
חדש-ה' 38.
955. מה זה איחלה מה עיני צבי חן לבבוני.—[טדרוס אבולעאפיה].
*ידיעות המכון 76.
956. מה זה איסר את זמן נמהר.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון
ב' 49.
957. מה יאמר עבד עברים אשר מפשע נמצא ועונותיו בו רודים.—
ס' מנצור. *תקופתנו 468.
958. מה יחליקון אויבי לשון ועל יד ישקו.—שיר נגד חנפים. *לעווי-
רשימה 25.
959. מה יפית ומה נעמת יפיפיה.—ס' שבתי [מאוטרנטו]. *ידיעות המכון 130.
960. מה לאהבי איבי בחובי ואבי מאביבי עבש.—סליחה לתשעה באב,
ס' א"ב, יחזקאל כהן [הכתבת על גבי הפיוט: סליחה לרבינו האי זצ"ל, לפי זה, הדבר
מוטל בספק מי הוא מחברה של הסליחה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 63*57.
961. מה לדמעות ברית כרתו לעינינו.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות
המכון ב' 25.
- מה לדמעי אשר ירוה לחיי (423).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 23.
- מה לי חזמן יכאיב כואב (427). *רמב"ע-דיואן 36.

962. מה לי ולמדה החמודה שבכם. — שיר על הפרעושים — [רפאל משה אלבאן].
*שיר חדש-ה' 12.
963. מה לי ללכת אחרי ההבל והמצוי. — סי' מסעוד [מה... סבבני... עלי לחיי... וספקתי... דבר] בן יחיה. הערה: המו"ל לא הבדיל בין הדבקים ותחת לנסח: „בלב שלם ובר עלי לחיי" מנסח: „בלב שלם וברוע לי לחיי". *תקופתו 467.
- מה לך אמה לי תכבשי (450). *ספר היובל לקרויס 208.
964. מה לך לבנות רום היכלות. — [סעדיה לונגו]. *זאת ליהודה 69.
965. מה לך צביה פה אשר תשכבי. — [יעקב פראנשיס]. *מבחר-שירמן 282.
966. מה לך רואה איש הנכאה אל מה תביט ומה תחשוב. — תוכחת המת לחי. *לעווי-רשימה 102.
967. מה לך תלך מר דודי ועמי יין חמר. — שיר אזור [שלמה אבן גבירול].
*יריעות המכון ב' 142.
968. מה לעיני נמנעה משנתה. — [טדרוס אבולעאפיה]. *יריעות המכון 28.
- זמה מבורך הוא מקור ישראל. — ח'ד (1) מן הקרובה: אחד אחה ומי ישיבך.
969. מה נאוו על ההרים רגלי מבשר בהשמיעו כי צאן תעה ביערים. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 257.
- מה נאוו על ההרים רגלי מבשר משמיע שלום מבשר טוב וניחומים (528). — *חפץ חיים ח'ב (הללות סי' ה).
970. מה נעמה שבת ומה כבודה ריחה קני בושם ומר וקדה. — סי' דוד בן יוסף (בבית האחרון). *חפץ חיים ח'ב סי' י"ב.
971. מה נעמו יונים ירננו בינות עצי עדן יקננו. — [יוסף אבן ששת]. *יריעות המכון ב' 180.
972. מה נעמו לכסיל וכימה משי ורקמה. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 251.
- מה ערבו לי ימי חברה ומתקן (592). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 200.
- זמה תהמי עלי ומה תצעק רימת אנוש. — ע"י מה לך רואה איש הנכאה.
973. מה תהמי עלמה ומה תשתוחחי. — [אברהם בן דוד פרווינצאלי]. *מבחר-שירמן 247.
974. מה תשבי עצובה כאשה עלובה. — [ראב"ע] ? *תרביץ ה' 70.
- מה תשמאל דודי או תאמין (651). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 246.

975. מודה אני לפניך יוצרי אלהי ואלהי אבותי. *רשימה-שירמן 124א.
 †מוכיחים יונעם להם. —ח'ב מן הקדושתא: אם ישמעו לי שבטי חיילים.
 †מוסר תנחיל לשבטים. —ח'ב מן הקרובה: אלפתה לעם חשוקיך.
 976. מוקד בצלעותי מקור סבותי. *ניוסף אבן עקנין. *רמ'ש-געזאמ.
 שריפטען 88 (רק חלק מן הבית הראשון); מאנאין ט"ו 111.
 977. מורה נבוכים-יאיר חשכים, קומה ועל כל מלוכה-מְלָכָה, וזעם
 בנקלה-חסר לב מגלה, פנים בָּךְ-ריק מַדַּת והלכה. —שיר בשבח
 ספר מוֹנֵה להרמב"ם [שמואל צרפתי]. *רבעון האנגלי (מ'ח) כ"ה 401 [מביאו בלי
 שם המחבר ומנסח: ... יאור חשכים ועל כל מלאכה... רק בדת והלכה]; מערב
 ומזרח 63 [מביא שם המחבר ומנסח: ואור לחשכים... ועל כל מלאכה... חסר לב
 מנה פנים] שתי הנוסחאות שבדפוסים הניל משובשות לפי דעתי ותקנתי על פי השערתי.
 מושיעי לעתות צרה גאולת עמך הואל. —ס' משלם [חסופר מפירוגא]. *לוח 61 מבחר
 שירמן 182 צ' 507 [מביאו בהתחלה: מרום שבתו (2366)].
 978. מות אשר החזיק בכנף מעילנו. —[ר'א הבבלי]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א
 34 (רק הבית הראשון).
 †מוזכרים גשמים במוסף תפלתם. —ע' גשם אוצרות שפרה.
 979. מומור אפצח בראש השנה להללה. —מעריב ר"ה ושבת-ס' א"ב (מניע
 עד ט'). *גנוי שירה 92.
 980. מחמד תבל ריק והבל. —[סעדיה לונגו]. *וואת ליהודה 67.
 †מחנות איש צורים. —ע' אימת עם זו.
 †מחנותם ונסעתם גם קדוש בעדתם. —ח'ב מן הקרובה: אחריך המשכתה
 קהלים.
 981. מחסי נפשי לך נכספה ונשמתי עיפה. —פ* יא 18.
 982. מי אל גדול כאלהים עושה נפלאות לבדו. —ס' מנחם]. *רשימה-
 שירמן 125.
 983. מי גבר בעולם קם כמשה. —ח'ד מן הקרובה: אומן שלא קם כמותו-בלי
 סימן. *קובץ על יד, יא 11.
 984. מי גבר יחיה ולא יראה מות. —סלוק של הקרובה: אומן שלא קם כמותו.
 *קובץ על יד, יא 16.

985. מי האיש החפץ לראות אותם תמונת כל דברי חכמים וחידותם.—שיר בשבח ס' דרש משה לר' משה בר יצחק מפיוענץ קראקא ש"ן.—
[המניה ישעיה הסופר]. *דרש משה 6: תולדות הרפוס 12.
986. מי הוא זה איזה הוא נבער מדעת.—שיר בשבח הספר—יצחק בן אשר שלום [המניה]. *שער בת רבים ד"ו 1714 ח"א דף שנ"ח ע"ב.
- מי זה בא בגיל ובשמחה אל תוך הלבבות (1057).—סי' משה כהן [אבן נקטילה].
*ידיעות המכון ג' 78.
987. מי יראני ארון התפארת.—לט' באב—סי' א"ב [קליר ?]. *גנזי שירה 27.
חורב א' 29.
988. מי כמוך אומר ברוח רצונו ועושה.—פיוט לפורים—סי' אני אנכעכ (?).
מדרוס נטריה רחמנא בן מאיר לוי נוחו בעדן. *ידיעות המכון ב' 65.
989. מי כמכה אל מושיע וגואל אלהי ישראל אדון כל היצורים.—
סי' א"ב (מגיע רק עד צ'). *גנזי שירה 118.
990. מי כמכה דגול בסוד שרפי המולה.—סי' דויד, א"ב, אבן בקודה ה"ש.
*הדנו (אייר תרצ"ו עמ' 192).
991. מי כמוך חסין יה אל גדול רב העליליה.—סי' מתתיה חזק. *פ—יא
62. ועוד פעם בעמ' 184.
992. מי כמוך נהדר בהדר והדר.—עברית ולועזית—סי' מתתיה חזק. *פ—יא 176.
- 992A. מי כמוכה צור רב חסד נצור.—סי' א"ב (לקוי באמצע), אני רחביה בן יהודה ממד [נין]ת כל [ניסיה חזק בתורה נצח]. *אמת ליעקב 23.
993. מי כמוכה שוכן עד.—סי' שלמה (כל אות ב' פעמים) א"ב, אני שלמה הקטן. . .
חזקו ויאמץ. . . *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 201*213.
- מי לא ייראך מלך הגוים (1216).—*מבחר—שירמן 179.
994. מי שאהב את האבות יאהב את הבנים.—סי' א"ב. *סדור כנה"ג 73.
995. מי שם לאיש שופט ושר עלינו.—[יעקב פראנשיס]. *מבחר—שירמן 281.
996. מיום ראשון עד יום ששי זכור את יום השבת.—זמירות—סי' יצחק [הנדלי]. *משא קרים 185.
- מידעי יריבון כי עירי אני הולך (1302).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 230.
- זמים נסכה בשבעה סכוכה.—ע"י גשם אוצרך תרוה אימתך.

997. מכאב לב אצעקה על צבי חן. — [יוסף אבן סהל]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 150.
998. מכבד איש יקר והשרש עקר. — [יעקב טרפון]. *מנחה לדוד 213.
999. מלוא אש הוד והדר לאור יאור. — סי' שלמה מבורך. *רשימה-שירמן 127.
- מלאכי צבאות חיילות (*56). — סי' א"ב כפול (אותיות ה, ו, ס, ע חסרות). *פיוטים ספרדיים 9.
1000. מלאכי רחמים שלח מהרה. — סי' אני יצחק. *רשימה-שירמן 126.
1001. מלאכת שיר כורע המלוכה. — [מנחם די לונזאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
- מליצתי דרשתיה ואינה (1615). — *רמב"ע-דיואן 140.
1002. מלך אוהב נקיי כף בראש השנה אדרוהו בכף. — יוצר לר"ה, סי' א"ב (כפול) עם פזמון סי' לעזר [המזל מיחסו לקליר, וצ"ע]. *חורב ב' 11.
1003. מלך איום ונורא אמרי האזינה. — סי' מיוחס מאוטרנטו. *ידיעות המכון 126.
1004. . . . מלך הציב שבעה מרומים. — שריד מפיט לר"ה-סי' ה'-ט' עם חרוז חור סי' אלעזר [קליר?]. *חורב ב' 6.
1005. מלך חי וקים לעולמים. — סי' מנחם הקטן ברבי בנימין חזק ואמץ אמן ואמן. *רשימה-שירמן 128; מבחר-שירמן 117.
1006. מלך עולם אשר נעלם שיר ותהלה לך. — סי' משה רמוס. *מבחר-שירמן 189.
- מלך עליון ארתכי תרשישים (1655). — סי' א"ג ה"ז וכו', יהודה. אמת ליעקב 143.
1007. מלך רחמן רם על רמים חי וקים צור עולמים. — סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 39.
1008. מלך רם ברום על כל רם ברום. — כרוג [אולי היא רק חתימה]. *תהלות לאל 4.
1009. מלך רם כי אין לך שני בגדי ישע הלבישני. — סי' מרדכי. *פ-יא 137.
1010. מלך שוכן בשמימה לו יד אלים [צ"ל ארים]. — סי' משה. *פ-יא 68.
1011. מלכי אדיר אתה צור שוכן סנה. — סי' מתתיה חזק. *פ-יא 37.
- מלסטם הבריות בחרב פיפיות (1764). — *עלים ב' 46.
1012. ממאפל לילה דיו תקחו. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 88.

1013. ממדנח שימשא ועד מעלניה.—פיוט ארמי-סי' א"ב. *גנזי שירה 112.
1014. ממלכתך מלך במרומי עליות.—סי' אני יוסף הקטן (כל אות שתי פעמים מלבד ה'יד של „אני” ושל „יוסף” והטית והגון של „הקטן”) [אכן אביתור]. *פיוטים ספרדיים 8. עי' ג"כ הדאר כרך ט"ז גליון עשרה עמ' 162.
- ממעלות גבהי זבול הופיעה (1804).—*תקופתנו 451.
1015. ממקומו נתן ברית.—חלק ח2 מן הקרובה לסדר פינחס בן אלעזר. *ידיעות המכון ב' 263.
- מנאף עם נשים מבוה הקדשים (1853).—*עלים ב' 47.
- †מנת שפר חבלים.—עי' איש חם בטוב אסמחה.
1016. מסלד עם צירים למות קול תרים.—[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזאת ליהודה 68.
1017. מספד מר אעורר מעי אוחילה.—קניה על אבנר ישראל הצרפתי. סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 69:
1018. מספד מר כתנים ואבל אעשה.—קניה על אחות אביו-סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 67.
1019. מעי אוחילה אשא לבדי קול מר ונהי.—קניה על עמרם אלבאז-סי' רפאל משה [אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 63.
1020. מעשה אלהינו ארתכו מכל עין מחובה.—לר'ה-סי' א'-ס' (כל אות ה' פעמים). *גנזי שירה 99.
- מעשי אדני הדרושים בקהל קדושים שפרה ברוחו שמי שחקים (2054).—סי' משה הכהן [אבן גקטילה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 75.
1021. מפלטי מאויבי וגם מרודפי קמי.—*פ-יא 138.
1022. מפעלות מלכי בקדש חם לבי בזכרי.—רשות לשבת הגדול של שבועות סי' משה בר בנימן [הסופר] חזק ואמץ בתורה. *מבחר-שירמן 74.
- †מצדקת אבות ישיני מכפלה.—ח"ב מן הקרובה: אביגדור בירך (לא נשאר מחלק זה רק ד' חיבות אלו).
- מצור באחה העיר והעיר היא נבוכה (2142).—סי' מנחם [בר עקב בר שלמה]. *הערבערט פישער: דיע פערפאססונסערעכטליכע שטעללונג דער יודען אין דען דויטשען שטעדטען דעס 13טען יאהרהונדערטס, ברעסלוי 1931 עמ' 189–191 עם תרגום אשכנזי עמ' 191–192.

1023. מצות ציצית הוד ועטרת. — סי' פרץ. *רשימה-שירמן 132.
- מצות שבת נחנה אל (2149). — סי' מימון. *תהלות לאל 8:
- מצחק עם ריקים יבקקוהו בוקקים (2154). — *עלים ב' 45.
1024. מקוה ידי שואל אסור לישראל כי אין בתורת אל זולת דמות מעין. — [משה כהן פורטו]. *פלגי מים 46.
1025. מקום מקדש קדושי אל. — סי' מרדכי. *רשימה-שירמן 133.
1026. מקור חיים אשר יצר בחסדו. — סי' מיוחס [מאוטרנטו]. *ידיעות המכון 125.
- מקנא בחברו הוא עוכר שארו (2255). — *עלים ב' 47.
1027. מראה הכוס כדמות ספיר. — שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמירקה תרצ"ה 232.
1028. מראות דמות הכוס כאש אוכלת. — שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמירקה תרצ"ה 232.
- מרבה בשר מרבה רמה... וכאיש דמים ומרמה יגלה בראש גולים (2296). — *עלים ב' 46.
1029. מרבה מליו לא ידע כי בהם חייו או מיתתו. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 58.
1030. מרום אל חי רם ונשא סונום ביריסי באשלה. — עברית ואיספאנולית (?). סי' משה. *פ-יא 61.
1031. מרום אלי מתקוממי אבוס ייאמו אריספונדימי. — עברית ואיספאנולית. *פ-יא 136.
1032. מרומם חי יברך נא. — סי' מיוחס [מאוטרנטו]. *ידיעות המכון 125.
1033. מרי במורה יאמרו מורים. — שיר בשבח ס' מו"נ. *צינבערג-נעשיכטע ח"ב 168 [ובצלום 169].
- †מריח גן עדן מברך הריח. — עי' אומץ חלק.
- מרשות אל אלהי ישראל אין קץ ואין חקר לתבונתו (2451). — ח"א סי' א"ב (כמנפץ כפולות). ברוך; ח"ב סי' אני ברוך בר שמואל הקטן [ממנצא]; ח"ג וח"ד בלי סימן. *רשויות לחתן 35.
- מרשות אלהי עולם שמים וארץ קנה (2458). — ח"א סי' א"ב, אני, א, אפרים בר רבי יעקב מבונא; ח"ב סי' אפרים רבי יעקב חזק גמר חוב ח"ג סי' אני אפרים הנקרא

שלוש מבונא נהסימן, מבונא יצא אם ננסח בעמוד כ"ט שורה ג', בגבורה ת', ובגבורה' ובשורה ה' תחת הנוסח, יראת מאת למו ראש מים להשיבנה' ננסח, נראים [בזאת?] למורא שמים להשיבנה'. באותו פיוט נמצא, רכלת' תחת, רוכלים, א"כ ראוי לשער שהחזיו של, יראת' היא תחת ים ומכיון שהבית צריך להתחיל באות נו' לא רחוק הוא שצ"ל, נראים]. ח"ד סי' שלום הוא אפרים הצעיר בן רבי יעקב חזק. *רשויות לחתן 26.

מרשות אלהי קדם עוטה אור כשלמה (2460). *רשויות לחתן 11. [באוה"ש בערך זה צריך למחוק מן ד) שבאמצע שורה 6 עד ד) שבאמצע שורה 6].

1034. מרשות האל הנאמן לנוצרי בריתו ועדותיו. —רשות לחתן יצחק בר שמשון נקדון]. לפיוט זה ארבעה חלקים. ח"א סי' ישעיה מ"ב, ה', יצחק; ח"ב סי' תהלים י"ט, ח-ט, יצחק; ח"ג סי' קהלת י"ב, יא-י"ב (המלה, הרבה' אחרי, ספרים' חסרה), יצחק; ח"ד סי' תהלים מ"ז, י', יצחק בר שמשון. *רשויות לחתן 43.

מרשות יחיד חי העולמים מאד נעלה (2484). ח"א סי' יהודה ברבי קלונימוס ברבי משה; ח"ב — ח"ד כל אחד סי' יהודה. *רשויות לחתן 17.

1035. משובח ומפואר בעלמא יה קורא הדורות מראש. —סי' יוסף. *פ-יא 39.

1036. משכיל קראוני למען מצאו אותי מאד משכיל. —מן מקמאת טוביה [המזל' מיחסו לר"י חרזי על יסוד השערות בלתי מבוססות]. *חורב א' 183.

משפט אות ברית בתרים ללחי תורים אנא זכור (2660). סי' א"ב. *אמת ליעקב 136. משתיל הנדוד לבבי בלי יד (2678). *רמב"ע-דיואן 204.

משתרר בגדולה ומבקש מעלה (2679). *עלים ב' 48.

†מתי מלכות מעדינה. —ח"ב מן השבעתא: אומן מצורים אל חקתה.

†מתנת דת יום חתנתו. —ע"י אומן שלא קם כמותו.

1037. נבהל להון אם על כל הון מלוך ימלוך לא יאמר הון. —[נמנחם די לונאנו]. *דרך חיים-לונאנו עמ' xxx; שתי ידות 149.

1038. נבון לחש ואיש שומר אמונים. —שיר בראש מכתב ששלח אליהו בשיצי לר' נחמו בר אברהם טרוקי. סי' נחמי. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"ב 1160.

נבטח בהפיק זמן כמעט זמנינו (70). *רמב"ע-דיואן 134.

1039. נבלי דמעות מערף יתאפקו. —קניה על מות הרמב"ם [מאיר הלוי אבולעפאי]. *חריבץ שנה ו' (תרצ"ה) 260; ידיעות המכון ב' 32.

1040. ... נבקעו ברביעי ... נה בזמן ... לה. ויהי הגשם על הארץ. — סופו של הפיוט: אוכרת שבחו של אדם בפניו לא מזכירים לשמואל יזכה בן הושענא השלישי — סי' ס'—ח', [שמ]ואל. *גנוי שירה 43.
1041. גנן והכוס מלא. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המוכן 68.
1042. נגע קשה פשה בלב בכתב דודי כלו הוסר. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 162.
- נדוד כרת לעפעפי בריתו (128). — *רמב"ע—דיואן 229.
1043. נדודיך הידיד הנדיל יגוני. — [משה בן שמואל צפתי]. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"ד 251.
- נהה גבר אשר כלו שנותיו (154). — *רמב"ע—דיואן 128.
- נודו לאיש גדל מאד צירו (203). — *רמב"ע—דיואן 156.
1044. נורא תהלות גומל חסדים טובים. — סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה' 42.
1045. נחמד למראה ונאוה. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המוכן 12.
1046. ניב שפתי קצר קצור להלל יושב שמים. — סי' רפאל משה אלבאן. *שיר חדש—ה' 41.
1047. נמלא פינו תהלה לאל יוצרנו היום כן האר נרנו. — ומירות לשלש רגלים. סי' נפתלי הכהן. נפתלי הכהן חזק (בראשי הבתים) א"ב (בחרו ב' וד' מכל בית) הפסוק והגדת לבנך וכו' (בחרו השלישי מכל בית). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 67.
1048. נמלא פינו תהלה לאלהי ישראל אחרון וראשון. — ומר לסכות. סי' נפתלי (בבית ראשון) נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרוים הראשונים של כל בית) הפסוק אך בחמשה עשר יום לחדש השביעי (בראש כל חרוז ב' מכל בית) א"ב (בראש כל חרוז ג' מכל בית) הפסוק: ולקחתם לכם ביום הראשון פרי עץ הדר (בראש כל חרוז ד' מכל בית). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 68.
1049. נעים דודי יפה רפאני וארפה. — *פ—יא 111.
1050. נעימות פאר תורתנו לא יסלה. — ומר לשבועות. סי' נפתלי הכהן (בבית הראשון) א"ב (בחרוים הראשונים והשלישים של כל בית) נפתלי הכהן חזק ואמץ אמן סלה (בחרו ב' וד' של כל בית). *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 69.
1051. נעלם ונסתר מכל רעיון נאצל מאין סוף הוא כתר עליון. — פיוט על עשר ספירות — סי' נפתלי הכהן (כל אות ג' פעמים) חזק. *סדור כנה"ג ח"ג 56.

1052. נער במעלליו יהי נכר אם זך וישר פעלו. —[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 48.
1053. נערה חץ דרכה. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 9.
1054. נפלאה אהבתי עד מאד גדלה. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 44.
- נפש אשר בכבוד אלהים נהדרה (422). —*חורב ג' 6.
1055. נפש אשר לא שמעה תוכחת עד אן משובתה תהי נצחת. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע—דיואן 76.
1056. נפש ורוח איש ונשמתו ייקץ ויעור מתנומתו. —[מנחם די לונזאן]. *דרך חיים—לונזאן עמ' xxx. שתי ידות 149.
1057. נפש שביה ביד צביה. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 52.
1058. נפשי יחידה נא לעצמך טהרי. —ס' שעדיה בן למשה טויל. *תקופתנו 459.
1059. נפשי נארי [צ"ל נערי] שחרי אל בת דוד רומה. —פ—יא 111.
- נפשי תקנא ברשעים כי נחו ביום רגז ושקטו (565). —*רמב"ע—דיואן 77.
1060. נפשנו מילטתה כצפור. —ח"ד מן הקרובה: אימת עם זו ליניי. *ידיעות המכון ב' 258.
1061. נפתחו דלתי וצירי. —[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 48.
- נקלותי בעיניהם בשומי יקר פני כמדרך פעמיהם (590). —*רמב"ע—דיואן 55.
1062. נר חנוכה אורו יהי מיופה. —ח"ג מן הקרובה: חה אלי בנס הנסיס. ס' א"ב, פנחס הכהן חזק (אותיות חזק כפולות ד' פעמים) *ידיעות המכון א' 164.
1063. . . נשמת המון זרוח כשלג קרוח. —ס'. . . ה בר יהודה גבירול (כל אות ד' פעמים) חזק. *ירחון ע"ז 439.
1604. נשמת משכימי בבקר למלל גבורות. —ס' משה כהן [אבן נקטילה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 83.
1065. נתיב סודות להורות, לאישים רעיוניהם נבוכים, כאיזה ענין אורו מאורות, אלי נוחלי יסוד עולם ברוכים. —חרוז מיוחס לרב האי ומובא בבית עקד האגדות ח"א 17 ס' ט"ו.
1066. סבה ועלה ומעמיד אל חי לכל יש מצאתיו. —[סעדיה לונגו]. *חזקת ליהודה 67.
- סוד לבי ומצפוני גלו נחלי עיני (68). —*רמב"ע—דיואן 253.

1067. סודות בנועות עמקו וגם גבהו.—[משה הנולה מקיעו.] *צינבערג-
געשיכטע ח"ה 349.
1068. סורה אלי בענה אחי הרף ממני.—[עמנואל בן דוד פראנשיס.] *מבחר-
שירמן 309.
- סותי אהבים אלכש כמדי (110).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 248.
1069. סליקא וחסילא מסכת יבמות, שיר ושבח והלל והודיה
ורוממות.—חתימה למס' יבמות כ"י ב"מ Add. 17062. *רשימת ב"מ ח"ב 93
(ס' 474).
1070. סמכוני ביין שפת עפרי.—שיר אזור לחתונת יוסף בן לכתוש—[יהודה אבן ניאט].
*ידיעות המכון ב' 188.
1071. ספר נעים שערי דורא על שם יצחק רב מדורא.—שיר בשבח הספר
[אליהו בחור]. *שערי דורא ד"ו 1547 (בסוף הספר).
1072. עבי יגונים כוכבי רום עממו.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות
המכון ב' 61.
1073. עד מתי כל צר ואויב קרב עורך.—ח"ד מן הקדושתא: אם ישמעו לי
שבטי חיילים. *זולאי 74.
1074. עד מתי עדת הדורה.—*רשימה-שירמן 141.
1075. עד מתי עמך תעו אשר אין להם ראש נתעו.—ח"ד מן הקרובה: אחריך
המשכחה קהלים. *זולאי 34.
1076. עד מתי פזורנו סחי ומאוס היינו כולנו.—ח"ד מן הקרובה: אלפתה
לעם חשוקיך. *זולאי 30.
1077. עדי אן הזמן תפרע פרעות.—קינה על אלעזר בן כלינאת [ר"א הבבלי].
*מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 305; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 322.
1078. עדי אן הזמן תשיא אנשים.—[ר"א הבבלי.] *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 297;
דיואן ר"א הבבלי 316.
1079. עדי אן תברחו מחץ תמותה.—קינה על איש שמו יפת [ר"א הבבלי].
*מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 277 (מביא רק בתים בודדים ממנו). דיואן ר"א הבבלי 306.
1080. עדי כסא זבול רוכב ערבות.—ס' עבדיה [בן אברהם ירא מברטינורא].
*מבחר-שירמן 209.
1081. עדי מה שורר בן אמה.—*רשימה-שירמן 143.

1082. עובר שאל עלי ותדע כי כבר דרתי בארמונים אשר פסגתי.—
[יעקב פראנשים.] *מבחר-שירמן 284.
1083. עז תעצומך יוצרי כל לשון תמלל.—שיר אזור לרונש [אכן לבראט?].
*ידיעות המכון ב' 137.
1084. עומד לשחר את פני הרב של את נעליך ואז תקרב.—[מאיר הלוי
אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 46.
1085. עורה כבודי ואל תאחר אעירה שחר.—ס' רפאל. *רשימה-שירמן 144.
1086. עורי יחידתי בענפי תמר.—שיר לחתונת יעקב בן משה טודרוס עם פנינה
בת יוסף לוי. [שמואל ארקיוולטי.] *תרביץ ה' 59 [מנסח בטעות בענפי חמר].
1087. עזוב את הזמן ינהיג לרוחו.—*כה לחי 20.
1088. עטרת מעלות שפלות וגבהות.—[מנחם די לונאנו.] *שתי ידות 149:
עין אשר מתשוקה דאבה (359).—*לוח-שוקן תרצ"ד 38.
עין בלי נומה היא גלתה סודי (361).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 252.
1089. עיני בת נדיבי מדין הדיבו.—שיר אזור [לשמואל הנגיד]. *ידיעות המכון
ב' 137.
- עיני זממי לי נכוחות חזו (378).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 61.
1090. עיני יורדה מים לספור לצרה יום עלה לשמים.—קניה על יקותיאל
אלבאז-ס' רפאל משה אלבאז. *שיר חדש-ה' 68:
1091. עיני יורדה מים תחתי ארגו בשומעי.—קניה על רפאל חיים דוד אבן
זמרא-ס' רפאל [משה אלבאז]. *שיר חדש-ה' 59.
- עיני יולו על משכבי (380).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 256.
1092. עיני מבור צר תצפינה הושע ממורה נא.—*רשימה-שירמן 146.
1093. על אמינתך וחסרך בכפלי כפלים אשר עשית עמנו ממעיים.—
ס' א"ב [לפני אות מ' בא המאמר 'יודוך אלהינו' באותיות גדולות וזה הטעה את
מאראקן לחשוב אותו לפיוט בפני עצמו. ע' מאמרו על מחזור כפא עמ' 467].
*כפא-כ"י 60:
1094. על הזמן תרב מרי שיחך.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון
ב' 39.

1095. על הרי בשמים ארח לחברני שם רעי. — עזרת לא' דפסח — סי' אברהם האורח בר רבי מתתיה חזק. *מבחר—שירמן 78.
1096. על התמורות צרות צרורות. — [סעדיה לונגו]. *וואת ליהודה 70.
1097. על כן יהי שפל ונדכה כי שכל בלב שפל מנחתו. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 64.
1098. על לב תכתוב דת אל. — [מנחם די לונגו]. *דרך חיים—לונגו עמ' xxx; *שתי ידות 149.
1099. על מה כאלמן עמי על מה. — סי' שלמה מבורך חזק. *רשימה—שירמן 148.
1100. על נהרות אבל דמעות יולו. — קינה על פטירת ר' יוסף בר אפרים קארו—[יצחק לוי]. *בערנהיימער—רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 158 (רק חלק מן הקינה) בשלמותה. 197
1101. על עוני ודוני את עיני לך אתלה. — [משה הכהן אבן נקטילה]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 83.
1102. על פתחי איומה בעברך פסחתה בלילה. — ח"ד מן הקרובה: אני אז נראיתי כבושם ערונות [לקליר?]. *עדעלמן 4.
1103. על שבר בת עמי אדברה קינים והגה אעירה. — קינה על גירוש ספרד בשנת רנ"ב — סי' אני שלמה בן שמואל ספרדי חזק אמן בנ"ע (בעדן נוחו עולם).
הערה: בשורה 242 אומר הפיטן: "תמצא שמי ראש בתיה", אבל המו"ל לא הרגיש כי בבתיים האחרונים יש שנוי בסדר החרוזים כי תחת שכל בית מכיל ד' חרוזים, יש כאן בתים בעלי ד' שורות ובעלי ג' שורות, והחרוזים שוים ב"ד שורות ואח"כ עוד י"ד שורות בחרוז אחר, ומפני זה לא מצא הסימן. והנכון שיד שורות הראשונות הן הדלתות וי"ד שורות האחרונות הן הסוגרים, וצריך לקרוא כך:
איכה אהיה למטהר (שורה 245) נפשי משכן לכל מקרים (שורה 259)
וכן הלאה על זה הסדר וע"י זה יוצא הסי' לנכון. *מאמרים לזכרון ר' צבי פריץ חיות, וין תרצ"ג 237–247 (חלק העברי). עי' ג"כ ירחון ע"ז 436–435.
1104. עליון אתה ומתנשא על כולם עליון בוידוי סדור על כל מפעלם. — סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 109.
1105. עליון תוכן רוח במשקלים. — סי' חשר"ק. *כפא—כ"י 114.
1106. עליך נפש עיפה נבעו מני מים קרים. — שיר על הרמב"ם. *מורה מקום המורה 76 (בדפוס זה נמצא כחלק מן השיר, עת לא יכלו' 1028). *מאונים ג' 411.
1107. עלמה בעיניה שנתי עשקה. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 80.

1108. עלמה לענות הלבבות נוצרה.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון 50.
1109. עלמות אחזו בידי עלמות.—[ר"א הבבלי.] *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"א 278; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 308.
- . עמי כל אל רמה לי יעשו חטיבה (761).—*ספר היובל לקרויס 209.
1110. עמי קרא לאליה לרוץ כתיר תוך קריה.—*פ-יא 175.
1111. ענה לדל שואל אל אלהי ישראל.—*רשימה—שירמן 152.
1112. עניו צבי חן ושפל אך רום אנשים בעינו.—[יוסף בן קביא.] *כה לחי 21.
1113. עפר ימתק כדבש רביב.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון 55.
- . עשה חסד ולא תזכור לאיש (961).—*חורב נ' 12.
1114. עשה נסים שנים עשר.—חלק 3 מן הקרובה לסדר פינחס בן אלעזר. סי' א"ב [יניי]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 263.
1115. עת הבנות באו לדלות מים ממי בור מדעם.—ג' בתים בראש הספר „בן פורת" (כ"י) לר' יהודה בן משה בן דניאל מרומה. *המליץ שנה כ"ו (תרמ"ז) גליון 153 עמ' 1877.
1116. עת נפשות שרי עם עולות שמים.—[שמואל ארקיוולטי.] *תרביץ ח' 62.
1117. עת פתח אל רחם לבי.—ב' בתים בסוף הספר „בן פורת" (כ"י) לר' יהודה בן משה בן דניאל מרומה. *המליץ כ"ו (תרמ"ז) גליון 153 עמ' 1877.
1118. פדה יה אביון משוע כי אתה תקותינו.—*חפץ חיים ח"ב (כלי מספר אבל בא מיד אחרי מספר ס').
- . פועל ישועות בקרב הארץ (33).—*חפץ חיים ח"ב (הללות סי' י"ב).
1119. פי לחמה נשק תוך מעוני.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון 74.
1120. פנה אלי וחנני אל מבטח כל היצורים.—*רשימה—שירמן 157.
1121. פנו דודים למלחמת ידידים.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מחקרים 124.
1122. פנו לראי מוצק כמראה הבזק.—[סעדיה לונגו.] *זאת ליהודה 64.
1123. פסח ארחו ידידים זכר למו אהבת חסידים.—מעריב לפסח - סי' א"ב (כפול) (אות ח"ו חסרה). *גניי שירה 124.
- †פעולת מנורה הוריתה באצבע.—ס' פינחס. ח"ב מן הקרובה: וזה אלי בנס הנסיסי.

1124. פרי שמחת מתי תבל דאגה.—[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע—דיואן 3.
1125. ... פתאום מבהמות ארץ צהל אורו על כנפות הארץ.—
סי' אתב"ש (נשאר רק מאמצע הצ' עד סופו). *גנוי שירה 72.
1126. פתו ימי נער ערומים חדו.—[רמב"ע.] *רמב"ע—דיואן 40.
1127. ... יץ משכיב ... וניתן ... [בניום] החמישי.—שריד מפיוט —
סי' א"ב (נשאר רק מן ט' עד ת'). *ערעלמן 28.
1128. צא לך בכור מות להרע.—[סעדיה לוננז] *זחאת ליהודה 67.
1129. צא מורי רום יה כאיש מלחמה.—סי' אברהם. *פ-יא 170.
1130. צבאות שוכנים במקום שחקים.—[ראב"ע?]. *תרביץ ה' 64.
- צבי ידמה לבד בשם (68).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 179.
1131. צבי יין הרקח בעיניו ישקני לו בפיו ישקני.—שיר לכבוד ילד בן ט"ו
בשם מבורך. סי' בלעם [יהודה אבן בלעם?]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 145.
1132. צבי נעים אשר קרע סגור לבי.—מן מקאמת טוביה [המל' מיחסו לר"י
חרזי, וצ"ע]. *חורב א' 185.
- †צבי ריחו כמור.—בית 4 מן צבי פניו מאירים כמאורים.
1133. צביה מבנות דורי אנוסה.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר—שירמן 228.
1134. צביה קדחה בלב רשפים.—שיר לכבוד ר' עזרא בן אלחקה. [ר"א הבבלי].
*מאנן—טעקסטס ח"א 302; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 321.
1135. צדודה נפשי צביה מבלי רשת מזורה.—[טדרוס אבאלעאפיה].
*ידיעות המכון 26.
- צהלו ידידי חתן ביום חתונת ריעכם (156).—*חפץ חיים ח"ב (הללות סי' י"א).
1136. צור את עמך אבשלום ברך ברוב עז ושלום יושב שחקים
ממעל.—סי' יהודה אלפאקי. *רשימה—שירמן 158.
1137. צר יעלה לבך ושמיר עז.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי.] *מבחר—שירמן 227.
1138. צור ישועתי בחסדך נורא בעליונים ותחתונים.—סי' צדקיה [מן
הענונים] שיר בראש הלכות דינין בשבלי הלקט כ"י פארמא. *היהודי שנה ב' 135.
1139. צור מעוז חוס על אמול בידי גוי.—סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר
חדש-ה' 44.
- ציון זה אל אדם ננס (298).—*מבחר—שירמן 325.

1140. צפור מרננת והסיסים מבין עפאים יתנו קולם.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 71.
1141. . . . קדושים לעירין קדישין עמי היום מקודשים.—שריר מן חלק של הקרובה לשבועות המתחילה . . . עשיה ושמייה [קליר]. *גנוי שירה 23.
- קו קו בארך הזמן נוכחו (64).—*ספר היובל לקריום 191.
- †קול פוער פה.—ח'ג מן השבעתא: אומן מצורים אל חקתה.
- קול קורא בהרים ונשמע ברמה (114).—*חפץ חיים ח"א 159.
- קום אשמדאי קום לך (138).—[עמנואל פראנשים.] *מבחר—שירמן 318.
1142. קום ידיד נפשי ובלבבי זכה.—[טדרוס אבואלעאפיה.] *יריעות המכון א' 79.
1143. קומי חבצלת כמו שרון.—*רשימה—שירמן 162.
1144. קונה אמת ואמונה קונה ברית מהונגה.—ס' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 110.
1145. קונה ארץ ושחקים קונה בינת משפטים וחקים.—ס' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 114.
1146. קח בת ענבים מברק חרבה.—שיר י"ן. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמירקה תרצ"ה 232.
1147. קח ידידי עצה טובה לא תחסר כל בה.—ס' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש—ה' 47.
1148. קח נא אסירך אל משוללו מלך ישראל וגואלו.—ס' יוסף נאבן צדיק]. *יריעות המכון ב' 172.
1149. קטון אני מכל חסדיך צעיר אני בתוך עבדי עבדיך.—ס' משה צפתי. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"ב 240.
1150. . . . קילוס מרדכי החיש מפי צר המבאיש.—פיוט לפורים ס' א"ב (כפול) מן א' עד צ' חסר. *גנוי שירה 58 [בגוף הספר מתחיל, החיש מפצר מבאיש' והמול תקן בדף מיוחד והעיר שפיוט זה איננו המשך של הפיוט הקודם].
1151. קנה בין ועשה עשר במשפט.—[רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר.] *קובץ על יד, י"א 66.
1152. קצף צבי אהוב ויחליף חקה.—[יהודה אבן גיאת.] *יריעות המכון ב' 190.
1153. קרא ספר הלזה יגלה לך רזי נכחות.—שיר בסוף כ"י של ר"א בחור [נ"א בחור]. *הצפירה שנה כ"א (תרנ"ד) גליון 60 עמ' 257.

1154. קרא שיחות ידיד נפשי נכחות.—שיר על מסכת פורים. [שמואל צרפתי].
*מערב ומזרח 59.
1155. קרעו סגור לבבי דודי.—[שדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 83.
- ז' . . . ימי אדם.—סופו של הפיוט אתה מבין שרעפי לב. נדפס כפיוט סתמי
בד"ח של האקאדעמיע ח"ה עמ' 90 וצ"ל: ראה ימי אדם צבא עלי ארץ.
1156. [רא]ה איך יחיה רגע ברחקך.—[יוסף אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 168.
1157. ראו האיש וצלמו ודמותו מכוער הוא כמו שטן בלכתו.—[נח בן
ישעיה מטרוקי]. *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ה 357.
1158. ראו מורה ובינו מעלתו ותראו בשחקים בית נכאתו.—שיר בשבח
מו"נ. *צינבערג-געשיכטע ח"ב 170 [בצלום 169].
1159. ראו ספר אשר חבר בתוך קבר ומטרה.—שיר בראש ס' ארון העדות
לר' יהודה בר' יוסף ברסאני (כ"י). *בערנהיימר-רשימת כ"י אמברוויאנא 148;
המוכיר י"ב 105.
1160. ראי עפרה הכי עפר יסודך.—[יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. *מבחר-
שירמן 226.
1161. רבון העולמים האזינה לקול תחנוניו אשר התחנונו לפניך
ברוב רחמין וברוב חסדיך.—תפלה על קבר ר' מאיר בעל הנס. *מאיר
בת עין—בגדאד 68.
1162. רבון העולמים ואדוני האדונים אשר בחר בנו מכל העמים.—
תפלה קודם למוד בישיבה של צפת שנוסדה ע"י אברהם אבואב. *מקורות לתולדות
החנוך ח"ג 30.
1163. רבון העולמים הרבה אתה עושה שאעזוב דתי תדע נאמנה
שעל כרחם של יושבי שמים יהודי אני ויהודי אהיה ולא יועיל
כל מה שהבאת ותביא עלי.—תפלה של אחד ממגורשי ספרד.
*שבט יהודה 90.
1164. רבון כל העולמים יצרתנו נקבים נקבים חלולים חלולים גלוי
וידוע לפניך חרפתנו וכלמתנו חרפה וכלמה בחיינו תולעת
ורמה במיתתנו.—תפלה למי שאין יכול להעמיד עצמו מלהוציא רוח מלמטה
בשעת התפלה. *יד החזקה הלכות תפלה פ"ד ה"ב.
1165. רבש"ע הריני יושב על הארץ להתאבל על כל עונותי.—[ועליג
בר יצחק אייזיק מרגליות]. *ספר חבורי לקושים ד"ו 1716 דף נ"ו ע"א.
- ז'רגלינו תעמיד במישור.—ע"י איש תם בטוב אסמחה.

1166. רדה אל גן אשר לבש תכלת וארגמן. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 188.
1167. רואי פנייחן הצבי חושקים. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 73.
1168. רובה בקשתו אל על חציו לנפשו ירה. — [דון וידאל בנבנשתי]. *כה לחי 23, כתאב ורוד ח"א 25.
1169. רוח זנונים לעשות הגדילה הרים. — [שמשון כהן מודון]. *מבחר-שירמן 351.
1170. רוח זנונים רב גדל הכח. — [שמשון כהן מודון]. *מבחר-שירמן 352.
1171. רוכב ערבות אדיר במשרה. — *רשימה-שירמן 169.
1172. רועי אליל בוזי בדין צוחו כי נשגבה. — [יהודה בריאל]. *מבחר-שירמן 347.
1173. רחם ה' אלהינו ברחמיך הרבים ובחסדיך הערבים ובטובותיך הצפונים . . . על קדושיך ואוהביך. — גוסס השכבה שאומרים בליל כפור בהר הנקרא אנבל. *הצפירה י"ד (1887) גליון 185 עמ' 4; נדפס שנית בהצפירה שנת תרנ"ז (1897) גליון 138 עמ' 696.
1174. רעי ומודעי שאלוני היש דבר אשר נעדר למצאו בזמן. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 79.
1175. רעית צבי גויה ירתה בחץ רמיה. — [יהודה בן גיאח]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 187.
1176. רעיתי לי אונך הטי נא. — [רפאל בן יצחק מפאנצה]. *מבחר-שירמן 203.
1177. רצונך יסד נא בלב עבדך אב הרחמן. — ס' רפאל משה אלבאו. *שיר חדש-ה' 52.
1178. רצית האל ארצך שבי פשע ביעקב. — רשות לברכו במוצאי יוכ"פ- [רפאל משה אלבאו]. *שיר חדש-ה' 52.
1179. רק ילכו בקרב חמה ושטף אף. — [שמחה קאלימאני]. *מבחר-שירמן 413.
1180. ש . . ולבוש נא תלבושת נקם. — ס' שלמה מב [ורד]. *רשימה-שירמן 218.
1181. ש . . רנה תדבר (?) נא לשוני בחמלתך בנה ביתך ודבריך. — ס' שלמה. *רשימה-שירמן 216.
1182. שאו הרים שלומי אל יפה נוף. — ס' שמואל אף נעים [שמואל אריפול]. *זבח תודה-קושטא עמ' 5.

1183. שאו למרום עיניכם הללו לאלהים.—סי' שם טוב חזק. *פ-יא 107.
1184. שאו עבים שלום קברי לאבי.—[מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 36.
1185. שאו קינה כקול יענה זממי חגרו שקים.—קינה על המנפה בשנת 1527. *ירחון ע"ז, 375.
1186. שאול ישאלון דו ללו ימללון.—סי' שלמה א"ב, שלמה בר יהודה. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 215.
1187. שאון קול זועקים האם סגדך.—סי' שלמה [בן אברהם מאורבינו]. *מבחר-שירמן 216.
1188. שאי רעיה על הרים נס.—סי' שמואל. *פ-יא 128.
1189. שאלוני בעד רע אהבתיו.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 238.
1190. שאלי איך לא נצפנו מדוי לבבי.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 255.
1191. ... שאם בחסדך אל ואל תפר אות הברית ביני ובינך.—[ר"א הבבלי]. *דיואן ר"א הבבלי 211.
1192. שב הזמן על קו וכל אח לא יעקב.—[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 2.
- שבח לאל נותן אונים (15*)—*בערנהיימר-רשימת כ"י אמברוזיאנא 100.
1193. שבחה ויקרא עוז וגבורה.—חרוזים בשבח הספר. *סדר תפלות-1681 (מעבר לשער).
- ושבחו מי אשר יוכל למלל.—עי' אלהים חי מאד נשגב.
1194. שבילים טבעות חותם.—סי' שמואל אריפול. *זבח תודה-קושטא עמ' 3.
1195. שבעה דרכים נמצאו בשיר.—שיר על דרכי המשקל—סי' שבעה המה, למחבר בלתי נודע. *כנסת ישראל ח"ב; חלק אורות מאופל עמ' 7; מגני ישראל בפריס 51.
1196. שבת משוש אנשי מקרא אמוני.—קינה על הקדוש דוד בר ישועה מנוח. סי' אני שלום בן אברהם חזק. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"ב 1209-1210 (רק קטעים ממנו).
- שבתי ותלתלי זמן לא שבו (350).—*רמב"ע-דיואן 20.
1197. שבתי לראות הנוראות בתבל זה והבליה.—[יששכר שמחה.] *ידיעות המכון ב' 104.

1198. שניא כח חי לעולם עד אנא תשכחני. *רשימה-שירמן 174.
- זשדי השקיף עלי ענוי. *בית שני מן פיוט לפסח: אודה צורי יה. *מאנן-
טעקסטס ח"ב 253.
1199. שואל בעצת נער וכסיל עמם יושוה צמיד פתיל. *יששכר שמחה.
*ידיעות המכון ב' 99.
- שואל לשון דעו בעד חבל (453). *רמב"ע-דיואן 206.
1200. שוב בך נכאה אל תשתאה. *סעדיה לונוגו. *זואת ליהודה 66.
1201. שובה אלי קבל שירה קול רינה במקום איל. *סי' שמי. *פ-יא 190.
1202. שובה עד מתי הנחם ושלח ינון מנחם. *פיוט לסיום מסכת חגיגה-נרפאל
משה אלבאז. *שיר חדש ה' 54.
- שובי נפשי למנוחכי כי ה' נמל עליכי (538). *חורב ג' 8.
1203. שוכן ברום צור משגבי אור פניו על עם קדושי יאר. *סי' שלמה.
*פ-יא 204.
1204. שוכן עד דרכו הצלחתה. *סלוק מן הקרובה לסדר, ואבוא היום אל העין
[בראשית כ"ד, מ"ב]. *סי' שמעון הכהן בירבי מנס. *ידיעות המכון ב' 222.
1205. שוכן עד וקדוש שמך בסוד חוסיך. *סי' שלמה נביר [ול]. *ספר השנה
ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 214.
1206. שולטני אב לי יה כי רב שכנתי תחתיה. *פ-יא 33.
1207. שום תשים לצאנך רועה צור מחסה. *סי' שמו[אל]? *פ-יא 144.
1208. שומר את עמו ישראל הקשב שועתם והואל. *סי' שלמה חוק.
*פ-יא 185.
- שומר לעם אביון בוחר בעיר ציון (675). *חקופתנו 454.
1209. שועתי מהר הקשיבה ענני. *סי' שלמה. *פ-יא 10.
1210. שוקדי דלתותי ישמחו ישמחו אוהבי. *רשימה-שירמן 179.
1211. שור ברק היין במזרק. *מדרוס אבואלעאפיה. *ידיעות המכון 60.
1212. שורה בכוס מעשה אמן. *שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמריקה תרצ"ה 232.
1213. שורש חתננו יפרח כשושנה. *סי' שלמה. *רשימה-שירמן 180.
1214. שורש ישי עומד לנס נדחי ישראל יכנס. *סי' שלמה. *פ-יא 53.

1215. שוש אשיש בישועתך בחדשך אבא ביתך. — ס' שלמה חזק. *פ-יא 78.
1216. שושנת עמק תפרח. — ס' שמעון הכהן יחי [בירבי מנס]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 224.
1217. שחר אעירה ואשיר שירה. — ס' שלמה מבורך חזק. *רשימה-שירמן 184.
1218. שחר אעירה ולבית קדשך אשירה. — *רשימה-שירמן 182.
1219. שי אונות כפילו ניבי. — ס' שלמה חזק. *פ-יא 155.
1220. שי אקריב לך נורא לאל איום. — ס' של [מ]ה. *פ-יא 156.
1221. שיבות זקני הסתיו הלבינו ראש. — [ישעיהו באסאן]. *מבחר-שירמן 361.
1222. שיר חדש אתן לאל נורא בניב שפתי. — ס' שמואל. *פ-יא 190.
1223. שיר ידידים אעירה אתן תודה. — *רשימה-שירמן 187.
1224. שירו כאילי יה שיר אל במשמר. — [יוסף אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 174.
1225. שירו נא שירו נא שיר חדש לאלהינו. — ס' שמואל בן שעיר. *חפץ חיים ח'ב (בלי מספר אבל בא בעמ' 24, לפני מספר י"ז).
1226. שירו שירים גזע ישרים. — ס' יוסף. *רשימה-שירמן 193.
1227. שירי בעת יקרב כשי תהי נערב. — שיר שלח ליצחק אבן פולקאר [שמואל בן יוסף אבן שושן]. *מנחה לדוד 200.
- שכור מיין התרעלה (1154). — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 41.
1228. שכור רע ישתה כחרש פתן. — ס' שלמה רוסו. *פ-יא 207.
1229. שכחתי מאכול לחמי מתגרת רודי וקמי. — ס' שלמה רוסו. *פ-יא 9.
1230. שלמה קהלת ותקוה תוחלת. — [יעקב טרפון]. *מנחה לדוד 219.
1231. שלמיד כטל חרמון להשקות גן עסיס יזלו. — ס' שלמה [רשב"ג]. *מנחה לדוד 183.
1232. שם טוב לטוב השם כי יחובר. — שיר בראש תשובה נ"ז. ס' שמואל. *תשובות מהר"ח אור זרוע 17; העיר על זה מ. הינער בהיהודי [שנה ב' עמ' 136 ס' 34].
1233. שם יעקב אבד ואך נטע שדו בכליותי. — [רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 32.
1234. שם קדשו יודה לבבי. — *רשימה-שירמן 198.

1235. שמואל הגביר חמדת נפשים.—[ר"א הבבלי]. *מאנן—טעקסטס ח"א 296;
דיואן ר"א הבבלי 313.
1236. שמור וזכור יום שבת לקדשו אל נורא ואיום כן דבר.—סי' שלמה
רוסן. *פ—יא 164.
1237. שמחו את ירושלים אמור אל אדון שמים.—סי' [מ]תחיה? *פ—יא 201.
1238. שמחי ועלזי כלה יפהפיה לבית בעלך קומי.—סי' שלמה ב' דוד יחי.
*חפץ חיים ח"ב [והללויה סי' ג'].
1239. שמים אמריו ינעימו.—סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 110.
1240. שמים ואורם יתהללו על מדורם.—סי' שלמה [המזל מיחסו לרשב"ג
ומסופקני]. *חורב ב' 250.
1241. שמים תלית ותמכת לתומיך.—סי' תשר"ק. *כפא—כ"י 115.
1242. שמך יה איש מלחמה חיש פדות יונה תמה.—*פ—יא 165.
1243. שמע בני דודק בדוק בחר בתוך ובר קלוף.—[שמואל ארקיולטי].
*חר ביץ ח' 62.
1244. שמע דברי שלמה במשלים וקהלת.—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי ידות 149.
1245. שמע קולי ברב חסדך אלהי.—[עזריה בן משה מן האדמים]. *מבחר—
שירמן 244.
1246. שמע קולי ואיעצך בני אל תעמוד הלכה.—[מנחם די לונאנו]. *שתי
ידות 149.
1247. שמעו נבונים רוזנים ומשנים שירים נבונים משיר אדני.—[משה
הגולה מקיעו]. *צינבערג—נעשיכטע ח"ה 349.
1248. שמעו עם קדש שיתו לב אל חידתי.—סי' שבתי [מאוטרנטו]. *ידיעות
המכון 129.
1249. שמעי בת עין וראי גם פקחי והטי את אונך.—[נ"ל שצ"ל: שמעי בת
והטי את אונך גם פקחי עין וראי]. סי' שבתי [מאוטרנטו]. *ידיעות המכון 127.
- שמעי כלילת הוד וחוץ במאד (1845).—*מבחר—שירמן 323 [מיחסו לעמנואל פראנסיס].
1250. שמעתי איד יוקש העיר אשר אבדו בה רב וצעיר.—[פיוט על הרעש,
בתמונת קרובה. כל חלק פותח בתבה מחבוק ג', ט"ז; סי' א"ב (מרבוע), שמואל בר
[שלום?]. *ידיעות המכון ג' 167.
- †שמש זבול.—עי' אלף פעמים אכרעה.

1251. שמתם לבבי ל"ם בי"ת זי"ן (=לבו) וכמו קין חגרתם זין. — שיר מסוג השירים הנרמזים סי' שהל אבן אברהם. *משא קרים 26.
1252. שנת עולם לעבדי בבקרים בשחרו. — [יוסף בן שמואל צרפתי]. מבחר-שירמן 229.
1253. שעה נא לקול רנני. — סי' שלמה מבורך חוק. *רשימה-שירמן 208.
1254. שעה ניב דל אדון אל יה. — עברית ולועזית — סי' שבת. *פ-יא 189.
1255. שער המים פתח לניסוך יום ששי תקבל שיפך לב. — שריד מפיט לסכות. *עדעלמן 30.
1256. שער לבן זקן יאיר. — [סעדיה לונגו]. *חאת ליהודה 64.
1257. שעריך בדפקי פתחה ויום אעטוף כשואל יד. — סי' שלמה. *רשימה-שירמן 209.
1258. שפחת שרי נשאה מעלי את רדידי. — סי' רפאל [משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 53.
1259. שפל רוח היה ואהב מלאכה. — [רש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר]. *קובץ על יד, י"א 66; כה לחי 24.
1260. שפר זה הספר תמונתו יסודו ובניינו לא נראה. — שיר במקום הקדמה. סי' שמואל בירבי דוד הלוי חזק אמן. *נחלק שבעה-אמטרדם 4: — פיורדא 3.
1261. שפתות מענות היום ערלות. — [מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 49.
1262. שפתי רננות טל תהלה נזלו. — [מאיר הלוי בן טדרוס אבולעאפיה]. *ניבוער — צלומים, צלום xviii; ידיעות המכון ב' 12.
1263. ... שפתים אדומות מפנינים ושנים כעדר הקצובות. — שריד מקינה. [ר"א הבבלי]. *מאנן-טעקסטס ח"א 296; דיואן ר"א הבבלי 314.
1264. שקט לבבי בשעון על ירך שמר. — סי' שמריה [בן אליהו האקריטי]. *מבחר-שירמן 168.
- שר בשירים לב נכאה בשבי (2169). — *חורב ג' 18.
1265. שרים ומלכים גלולים זעו נפלו כחללים. — *רשימה-שירמן 210.
1266. שרפי קווצות תשו לשמור פרי. — [טדרוס אבואלעאפיה]. *ידיעות המכון 62.

1267. שש אנכי על אמרת אל כי דבר טובה להביאם אל תוך אריאל. —סי' שלמה חזק ואמץ. *פ-יא 52.
1268. ... שש לשעבר ושביעית לעתיד ברוב צירים. —לר"ה —סי' ב'-ח'. *גנוי שירה 13.
- שתה אחי והשקני עדי כי ביד הכוס יגון לבי אמנן (2265). *רמב"ע-דיואן 35.
1269. שתה יין בלא מים לבדו. —שיר יין. *ספר השנה ליהודי אמירוקה תרצ"ה 233.
1270. תאוה לנה בלב כאש מצאתיה. —[יוסף אבן צדיק]. *ידיעות המכון ב' 165.
1271. תאות לבבי ומחמד עיני עפר לצדי וכוס בימיני. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 249.
- †תבענה שפתי תהלה לאל איום. —ע"י אברך את ה' היום יום שני. תגביר בכל רנע חסדיך (83). *רמב"ע-דיואן 46.
1272. תהי אונך קשבת והרחק מדבר שקר. —[רפאל משה אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 55.
- †תהלל נפשי את ה' בכל כחי וגבורה. —ע"י אהלל את ה' היום יום חמישי. תודה ומנחה הגיש והולבש. —חלק מסדר עבודה ליוכ"פ —סי' תשר"ק. *גנוי שירה 69.
1274. תורה צוה לנו משה הליכות אלי. —סי' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 54.
1275. תורה שבכתב ועל פה מתוק לנפש ומרפה. —*פ-יא 103.
1276. תורת אמת אל חי הנחילנו חיי עולם נטע בתוכנו. —סי' רפאל משה [אלבאן]. *שיר חדש-ה' 56.
- תחבושת אלפת למור מקוטרת (212). —סי' תשרק. *אמת ליעקב 134.
- תחלת מאמרים תהלות ומירים (224). —*רמב"ע-דיואן 56.
1277. תכוני יום שני אשר תכנת ברקיע שני אשר בחכמה הכנת. —סי' תשר"ק. *כפא-כ"י 61.
1278. תכונת הגביר תגיד חמודיו. —[רמב"ע]. *רמב"ע-דיואן 46.
1279. תכף למזרח העזרה אשר לו. —חלק מסדר עבודה ליוכ"פ —סי' תשר"ק. *גנוי שירה 71.

1280. תלולים בקומתם ובן עין לא תחזה.—חלק מקרובה לשבועות—סי' תשר"ק (עד אות ט'). *גנוי שירה 88.
1281. תלות עין אין רשות לראות בכסא.—חלק מקרובה, לשבועות—סי' תשר"ק. *גנוי שירה 86.
- תמה באי לגני אחי לקטי שושני (294).—*מחקרים 81.
1282. תמיד אז במ תתיחד.—חלק מקדושה למנחה יו"פ—סי' תשר"ק (עד כ'). *גנוי שירה 108.
- תמו ספנו מן בלהות ובהלות (341).—סי' תשר"ק, אליה בר שמעיה חוק. *מבחר—שירמן 42.
1283. תנה אל דיר תנה גילה וחמלה.—*פ—יא 215.
- תנה כוסי בעת נטו צללים (367).—*רמב"ע—דיואן 226.
1284. תנו שכר לאיש אבד ויין לשמח לבבות העצבים.—נרש"ט פלקירה בספר המוסר. [קובץ על יד, י"א 59.
1285. תרעיף שמים ממעל ממעל יזלו שחקים.—פיוט לגשם. סי' תשר"ק. *מחקרים 169.
1286. תרשישים עם תלולים יתנו תוקף קדוש.—חלק מקרובה לשבועות—סי' תשר"ק (רק אותיות ח'—א' נשארו). (הפיוט בשלמותו נמצא בכ"י אדלר 2676). *גנוי שירה 88.
1287. תשתבח אל נערץ בסוד שרפי קדש.—פיוט לנשמת רשום עליו: תפלה לרבן נמליאל הזקן—סי' א"ב. *כפא—כ"י 59.

לוח הפיטנים ורשימת פיוטיהם

אבטליון: אב אתה 4 אביעה שיר 14 אועק אל 136 אל ארוממך 202 אל בים 203 אל קדוש 244 אל שלה 248 אקריב קרבן 405 אשירה אשירה 436 **אבון:** אלי נא 286. **אביגדר בר חלפון:** איל מעין 128. **אביטבול:** אשיר שירה 435. **אברהם:** אביר תהלות 17 אברך אל 26 אהללה כל 80 אויבי עז 90 אל אבי ארוממנהו 184 אל אלהים יושב 195 אל אלהים לך 196 אל אמונה 200 אל בן דוד 204 אל גינת 207 אל חי מי 217 אל יחירי 221 אל נגדי 235 אל קרב 245 אלהי לך 264 אם פי 319 אסוף אלהים 386 אצלי שני 398 [?] אקו שמחת 401 אשא עיני 425 אשקוט ואביט 442 אתן את 473 אתי מלבנון 469 צא מורי 1129. **אברהם אבן עזרא (בן מאיר):** אדון נפשי 45 (?) אדון עולם 46 אל חי 214 אלהי שמע 265 (?) אלהים חסדיך 272 (?) אלהים ישגיה 273 (?) אמרו לגוי 339 דודים שוררו 556 יחיד מרומם 782 יעלה יפה 810 (?) לגבר שלהה 896 לקראת דוד 934 מה תשבי 974 (?) צבאות שוכנים 1130. **אברהם האזרח (בן מתתיה):** על הרי 1095. **אברהם בן חלפון:** בן אדם 513, 512. **אברהם בן שמואל:** איש משה 175. **אברהם חזן (בן יצחק):** אהליבה הבנויה 78 את כהני 447. **אברהם חי:** אחיא ואף 470. **אברהם יוסף חי:** אנחנו הצאן 365 (?). **אברהם הכהן (בן שבת):** כושית אשר 866. **אברהם ממודינא (בן דניאל):** אני אמרתי 368. **אברהם משה:** אני בה' אבטח 369. **אברהם פרוניצאלו (בן דוד):** מה תחמי 973. **אהרן:** אברכה את יי' 30 אל אלהים 198 אל בנה 205 ארנן שמך 417 אשיר שיר 434. **אהרן אלחדיף:** אלהי בגבורה 262. **אהרן בן ישועה:** אל נורא 236. **אהרן חבר:** אסיר תקותך 387. **אחיטוב הרופא מפלירמו:** אנא אדון 352 ברכי יחידתי 533 יסודות התורה 806. **אליהו:** אלהים ה' חילי 268. **אליהו בחור הלוי (בן אשר):** ספר נעים 1071 קרא ספר 1153. **אליהו בן עמרם:** אל נאמן 234. **אליהו בשייצי (בן משה):** אני חצים 376 נבון לחש 1038. **אליהו חזן:** אשירה נא 437. **אליעזר בר נתן (ראב"ן):** אלי עזרי 287. **אליעזר מרדכי אלטשולר:** ה' אלהינו 50. **אליעזר פאפו (בן יצחק):** לשם יחוד 940. **אליקים:** אלוה חי 258. **אלעזר:** אומן שפך 97 אחותי כלה 144 אני מלטתך 377 ארחות מישירם 414 ההתן יכהן 594 מלך אוהב 1002. **אלעזר הבבלי (בן יעקב):** איכה תמותה 165 אמנם אנהתך 329 אמרו לשר 342 הנכבי ים 613 ודניאל נגיד 661 ומה קלשון 667 זה באמת 674 זמן פרש 682 זמנים נתנו 683 חכם חכמי 694 ינחם אל 803 בוככי תהלות 862, 863 לך השר 908 לך שר 916 מות אשר 978 עדי אן 1077, 1078, 1079 עלמות אחוז 1109 צביה קדחה 1184 שאם בחסדך 1191 שמואל הגביר 1235 שפתים אדומות 1263. **אלעזר בירבי קליר:** אנודי לעבוד 32 אדרת מעטה 68 אהבת נעורים 69 אותו היום 112 או מכל 123 (?) אז עד 124 (?) אזור נא 126 אחד קדוש 141 אחותי כלה 143 אידת קטורה 151 אילת אהבים 166 או"א אור טל 275 אמצך ביום 334 (?) אני אז 366 (?) ארבע מלכיות 409 (?) ארבעה כחרים 410 (?) ארקות וגם 418 אשר שבילו 444 אשרי תמימי 446 את קולך 449 (?) אתאנו לך 450 (?) האומר ועושה 568 הושענא אל 589 הינו אתאנו 619 זה השער 675 יזו פועל 777 כבד מולידך 858 לא תרצח 887 מי יראני 987 (?) מלך הציב 1004 (?)

על פתחי 1102 (?) קדושים לעירין 1141. **אלקלע:** ארומם בשחר 413 (?). אנגלו
סאצירדוטי: נא בעינך 192. **אנטולי:** אל אלהים 194. **אפרים בן יואב**
ממודינא: אחי שמעו 147. **אפרים בר מתתיה הצרפתי:** אתן שבח 475. **אפרים**
בן צאלח: בשרנו יה 537. **אפרים מדונטשיץ (בן אהרן):** טוב לשבת 715.

בנימין: איומה אין 155 בידך עתותי 499 בקוראי ענני 525. **בנימין בר שמואל:**
 אז אמרתי 112A. **בנימין העניו (בן אברהם):** אם בניך 301 בידך אפקיד 498.

דוד: אל יושב 220 דודי צח 554 מי כמכה 990. **דוד בן יוסף:** מה נעמה 970.
דויד בן נשיא: אברו ישרי 7. **דונש אבן לברט:** עז תעצומך 1083. **דניאל:** יום
 אליהו 753.

האיי גאון (בן שרירא): איי מי 88 אמן אמונה 94 אותה נפשי 111 אין עמך 171
 אכן סר 183 אלהיך יוכך 266 אמר נא 336 אמרה סגלה 337 אמרו פרח 343 אנא עזב 361 הודו
 למלך 586.

יודאל בנבנשתי: אם לא ידעתם 314 רובה בקשתו 1168.

זעליג מרגליות (בן יצחק אייזיק): רבש"ע הריני 1165. **זרחיה:** זמן
 הישועה 680.

חיים: חגון רחום 699 חסדי ה' 702.

טדרוס הלוי אבו אלעאפיה (בן יהודה): אבי למתי 9 אדום מריבי 40
 אהלו מותח 77 אולי ברקים 92 איך אחי 158 אל תוסף 253 אם חשקך 308 אש מלכבי 421 אש
 נורכם 422 אשמח בכוסי 440 בא ידידי 488, 489 ברב צפצפו 528 בשפת ידידי 536 גוי דל 543
 דודי נא 553 רמעי ראם 562 דרך בבר 566 הבא כלי 576 חנה מה 618 הרבה אהה 633 חשק
 צבי 709 ידידי את 726 ידעת עלמה 730 יעלת אהבים 812 יעלת חן 813 כוס ועפרה 864 כסיל
 על 882 לנודר מי 922 לעפר אני 929 מה זה 955 מה לעיני 968 נגן והכוס 1041 נחמד למראה 1054
 נערה חץ 1053 נפלאה אהבתי 1054 נפש שביה 1057 נפתחו דלתי 1061 עלמה בעיניה 1107 עלמה
 לענות 1108 עפר ימתק 1113 פי לחמה 1119 צדודה נפשי 1135 קום ידידי 1142 קרעו סגור 1155
 רואי פני-חן 1167 שור ברק 1211 שרפי קווצות 1266.

יאשיהו: היום לא תקצר 596. **יהודה:** אם ישמעו 313 אשר עתידים 443 יה לדל 737
 יושבי חשך 775 יום ממת 778 ירד כמטר 840 ישעך ה' 861. **יהודה אבן בלעם:** צבי
 יין 1131 (?). **יהודה אבן גיאת (בן יצחק):** אהה איך 71 אלהים לחתן 274 יה
 ליעפים 739 יום כשחרים 764 סמכוני ביין 1070 קצף צבי 1152 רעית צבי 1175. **יהודה**
אלחריזי (בן שלמה): ידמוה אלי 729 ימימה עת 797 (?) ימימה תפתי 798 (?)
 יפו מאד 822 (?) משכיל קראוני 1036 (?) צבי נעים 1132 (?). **יהודה אלפאקי:** יקר
 יקר 834 צור את 1136. **יהודה אריה די מודינא (בן יצחק):** אנא ה' אלהי 353
 למי אחפוץ 919. **יהודה בן דוד:** יה אל 731. **יהודה בן זרבבל:** יום יהיה 761.
יהודה בריאל: רועי אליל 1172. **יהודה ברסאני (בן יוסף):** אם תשאל 323

חמסי על 696 ראו מורה 1159. יהודה הלוי (ברבי הלל): אדר מלי 66. יהודה
 הלוי (בן שמואל): ידע תרע 723 יערף לקחי 817. יהודה מצליח פאדובה
 (בן אברהם): אנוש עובר 363. יהודה קפנטון (בן שלמה): אם יעלה 309 מבינים
 ורעיונים 948. יהודה מרומא (בן משה בן דניאל): עת הבנות 1115 עת פתח 1117.
 יואב בן דניאל: יורו צבא 750. יואל גאלה: יהי חסדך 742 (?). יוחנן יהודה
 אלטרינו: אביעה מעש 13 יסד יסוד 804. יוסף: אל מי 226 אקרא לאלהים 403 חותם
 תכנית 690 יבושו כל 717 יהי נא 743 יהלל לאלי 747 יום אמר 755 יונה את 769 יוצר הרים 774
 יקר יחנו 837 משובח ומפואר 1035 שירו שירים 1226. יוסף אבן אביתור (בן יצחק
 בן שטנאש): ויהי אוי 569 ממלכתך מלך 1014. יוסף אבן ברזל: הצבי עיניו 627
 יושבת במאסר 776. יוסף אבן סהל: הגה בני 615 (?) מכאב לב 997. יוסף אבן
 עקנין (בן יהודה): מוקד בצלעותי 976. יוסף אבן צדיק: ארחמך צורי 415 האספו
 עליו 574 הכרת ליל 601 יצרתי ברוח 833 יוצר בני 773 קח נא 1148 ראה איך 1156
 שירו כאילי 1224 תאווה לנה 1270. יוסף אבן ששת: אל אלהים 197 אעיר לבבי 392 אצעה
 במר 399 מה נעמו 971. יוסף בולי: יכונן וישים 788 ימין עליון 799. יוסף בן גוריון:
 איכה ישבה 163. יוסף בן לביא: עניו צבי 1112. יוסף בר מתתיה: אדברה
 וירוח 38. יוסף בן רם המכונה אבולעיש: אני סודי 378 בני דע 516. יוסף
 זארכו (בן יהודה): ררך אניה 565. יוסף הלוי ספרא דבי דינא דפוזנא:
 אר'א ממעקים 278. יוסף צרפתי (בן שמואל): אהה כמה 72 אולכש שמחות 257 אם
 אכתבה 298 אם העליתם 304 אני אל 367 אני גומה 372 אראה צביה 408 בנב עינך 483 בעודי
 חי 519 בעורך רעננה 520 בתמהון יעקב 539 הלא זקנה 602 הסתכלי נפשי 624 השתעשעו ושעו 639
 ואם רחקת 642 זמן החן 679 זעומי אל 685 ילדה מתארת 789 ימי זקנה 793 ישנה את 850 מאור
 עינך 946 מאורות על 947 פנו דודים 1121 צביה מבנות 1133 צור יעלה 1137 ראי עפרה 1160
 שנת עולם 1252. יחיאל בן יקותיאל (בן בנימין הרופא): אני נבר 370. יחיאל
 מרומא (בן אברהם בן יואב): אנא הבט 358. יחיה בן סעד: אחלה
 בתחנוני 148. יניי: אופן לבנה 103 אות במועד 110 אתה יום 460 האומרים לכילי 569 המרומם
 על 605 וזאת אימן 656. יעקב: אל נעלם 237 אליך ה' 290 ידיד צור 724 יה אלה 732 יום
 יום 762 ישורר שירה 847. יעקב אבן צור: יה ישועתך 736. יעקב בנונישתי: יביע
 פי 720. יעקב ברבי שמשון: ליד ירח 792. יעקב גבאי (בן עזרא): הורות
 נבוכים 588. יעקב טרפון: אמת יהנה 349 יעירוני רעיוני 808 מכבד איש 998 שלמה
 קהלת 1230. יעקב נפתלי בן יהודה: אלהי אקרא 261. יעקב סגרי (בן יצחק):
 אשה בכל 248 הנה הני נשי 616 כילי אני 869. יעקב פראנשים (בן דוד): אשות זה 430
 לולי ידעתך 899 מה לך 965 מי שם 995 עובר ישאל 1082. יעקב תם (בן
 מאיר): ידידי יה 728. יצחק: אב רחמן 6 אל דר 208 א . . . שים ב . . . ענבים 432 בשחר
 אקום 534 דין עיר 559 יה השב 734 מלאכי רחמים 1000. יצחק אבן גיאת (בן
 יהודה): אתה הוא 459. יצחק אבן גיקטילה: אקדישה לאל 400 (?). יצחק בן
 אברהם עזיאל: אישים אשר 179. יצחק בן אשר שלום המגיה: מי הוא 986.
 יצחק די לאון: בעת קנאי 521 דוד בנביאים 561. יצחק חנדלי: מיום ראשון 996.
 יצחק הלוי: על נהרות 1100. יצחק מן הלויים (בן יעקב): יפתח לך 825.

יצחק לוריא המגיה (בן משה): בזמן שנה ⁴⁹⁴. יצחק המחוקק: אליהו נשאתי ²⁹². יצחק נקדן (בן שמשון): מרשות האל ¹⁰³⁴. יצחק סלמה: אל חי ²¹⁶ בן דוד ⁵¹⁴. יצחק שמואל: אביר כביר ¹⁵. ישועה החבר (כירבי נתן): אומץ דברות ⁹⁹ איך אומלל ¹⁵⁷ אל אחד ¹⁸⁷. ישעיה הסופר: מי האיש ⁹⁸⁵. ישעיהו באסאן (בן ישראל חזקיה): שיבות זקני ¹²²¹. יששכר שמחה: אני האיש ³⁷⁴ יבין שמע ⁷¹⁹ ידבר פי ⁷²² יהנה לשוני ⁷⁴¹ יהמה לבי ⁷⁴⁸ יוסף לקח ⁷⁷¹ יחי מלך ⁷⁷⁹ יליד המור ⁷⁹¹ יסכר פי ⁸⁰⁷ יעקב איש ⁸¹⁶ יעשה שרש ⁸¹⁸ יפה אורו ⁸¹⁹ יצא אב ⁸²⁶ יצא חוטר ⁸²⁷ יצא נפש ⁸²⁹ יצר הרע ⁸³¹ יקח שכל ⁸³⁵ יקר שירי ⁸³⁸ ירוחם עני ⁸⁴¹ לשואלים עצת ⁹³⁶ שבתי לראות ¹¹⁹⁷ שואל בעצת ¹¹⁹⁹.

כלב אפונדופולו (בן אליהו): איומתי בעת ¹⁵⁶.

לוי אלתבאן (בן יעקב): אל תשכח ²⁵⁶. לוי בן אברהם בן חיים: ארה מורי ⁴¹². ליב רופא שליט וואליך: אדם זכור ⁶⁴. ליאון הפרנס (בן מיכאל): לעד אומרה ⁹²⁷.

מאיר: אלהי ישועתנו ²⁶³ את צמח ⁴⁴⁸. מאיר חיים יצחקי: יום זה ⁷⁶⁰. מאיר הלוי אבולעאפיה: אהה קנה ⁷³ אל על ²⁴⁰ אם איש ³⁰⁰ אמנם עצת ³³¹ אם לשנת ³¹⁶ אמרו לחורפנו ³⁴⁰ אם הנדוד ⁴²⁰ הבו בנות ⁵⁷⁷ הוי כל ⁵⁸⁷ הלעד מעלות ⁶⁰³ הנה אני ⁶¹⁴ הרב לשבר ⁶³² הרימות בכל ⁶³⁴ הרפו מנהמי ⁶³⁶ יחידה בעדי ⁷⁸⁴ ילדי זממי ⁷⁹⁰ ימים אמונים ⁷⁹⁵ יצו אל ⁸³⁰ לבבי האדיב ⁸⁹¹ לך ליל ⁹¹⁰ לשונות למדו ⁹³⁸ מה זה ⁹⁵⁶ מה לדמעות ⁹⁶¹ מי כמוך ⁹⁸⁸ נבלי דמעות ¹⁰³⁹ עבי יוונים ¹⁰⁷² עומד לשחר ¹⁰⁸⁴ על הזמן ¹⁰⁹⁴ שאו עבים ¹¹⁸⁴ שפתות מענות ¹²⁶¹ שפתי רננות ¹²⁶². מאיר מפרינצו (בן יעקב): הפעם אורה ⁶²⁶. מיוחס מאוטרנטו: מלך איום ¹⁰⁰³ מקור חיים ¹⁰²⁶ מרום חי ¹⁰³². מנחם: אנה ה' ³⁵⁴ אהה אדון ⁴⁵² מי אל ⁹⁸². מנחם בן בנימין: מלך חי ¹⁰⁰⁵. מנחם די לונזאנו (בן יהודה): אדון יצור ⁴³ אל חתיה ²⁵¹ אל תחמלו ²⁵⁴ אם יעשה ³¹¹ אם יש ³¹² אנוש יביט ³⁶² באשה מעלות ⁴⁸⁰ ביום נהפך ⁵⁰¹ הכה בשבטו ⁵⁹⁹ ואם תרצה ⁶⁴³ ואמרו לי ⁶⁴⁴ יום מעלות ⁷⁸⁵ יום תת ⁷⁶⁷ ישמח ויבטח ⁸⁴⁹ כל טוב ⁸⁷³ לאסיא אוקיר ⁸⁸⁹ למראה איש ⁹²⁰ מלאכת שיר ¹⁰⁰¹ נבהל להון ¹⁰³⁷ נפש ורוח ¹⁰⁵⁶ עטרת מעלות ¹⁰⁸⁸ על לב ¹⁰⁹⁸ שמע דברי ¹²⁴⁴ שמע קולי ¹²⁴⁶. מנחם מאנש חיות (בן יצחק): או'א ממנו רחק ²⁷⁷. מנחם נווירה: אומר שירתא ¹³⁴. מנחם קוריצ'י (בן מרדכי הפרנס) מאוטרנטו: או לקהל ¹²⁰. מסעוד בן יחיה: מה לי ללכת ⁹⁶³. מרדכי: אספר תהלות ³⁸⁹ מלך רם ¹⁰⁰⁹ מקום מקדש ¹⁰²⁵. מרדכי מטיווילי (בן ברוך): מגילה מגלה ⁹⁵¹. מרדכי כומטינו (בן אליעזר): אם חזקה ³⁰⁶. משה: אל יוצר ²¹⁹ בכאבו נפשי ⁵⁰³ לעקרה לא ⁹³⁰ מלך שוכן ¹⁰¹⁰ מרום אל ¹⁰³⁰. משה אבן עזרא (בן יעקב): און הטה ⁸⁵ אולי בקרבת ⁹¹ אוה דמי ¹²⁵ אחי חסד ¹⁴⁵ איך יעמד ¹⁶⁰ איכה יתאפק ¹⁶⁴ אל אלהי ¹⁹³ אל המון ²¹⁰ אל יד ²¹⁸ אלו על ²⁸⁰ אמת תבל ³⁵¹ אני נבר ³⁷¹ במגורי ירדי ⁵⁰⁸ דרי יפת ⁵⁵⁰ דמעי יגרו ⁵⁶¹ הא אלמים ⁵⁶⁷ הוא המדבר ⁵⁸⁵ הנה יליד ⁶¹⁷ הנפשי בחרו ⁶²¹ הראותי ברכות ⁶³¹ הרף בוכה ⁶³⁵ והשכמנו הלומי ⁶⁵⁵ וכוס שהם ⁶⁶⁴ ומה לי ⁶⁶⁶ ונהר נהרו ⁶⁶⁸ וקדם האכיל ⁶⁷²

חולת אהבים 687 חסדי על 697 חפצי שללו 703 חתן וכלתך 711 חתן יהי 712 יאור במאפליה 716
 יברך צור 721 ידידותם כברק 725 ידידי הזמן 727 יום בו 758 יום הנדוד 759 יונה בצל 770 יחיד
 הדור 781 יצא לבבי 828 ירעני זמן 843 יתמה משכיל 856 כוכב כאשר 861 כל איש 870 כמה
 אני 875 כפיר מדע 883 כתבתיהו והמורק 884 לאט ללב 888 לולי כי 900 ליל מחשבות 905 לשון
 דמעו 937 מאד קלה 944 מאהב ירי 945 מה בצע 953 מה נאוו 969 מה נעמו 972
 ממאפל לילה 1012 נגע קשה 1042 נפש אשר 1055 פרי שמחת 1124 פתו ימי 1126 רדה אל 1166
 שאלוני בעד 1189 שאלני איך 1190 שב הזמן 1192 שם יעקב 1233 תאות לבבי 1271 תכונת
 הנביר 1278. **משה בן יואב:** אדון במדון 42 אועק למרחוק 137 אחי מדע 146 איך נאסף 161
 אישיר כלי 181 אמאס אני 324 אני קם 381 בבא האנחות 481 ביום ארשה 500 בראש הנבונים 527
 הן עת 612 יום בא 757 ימים ולילות 796 לי יאמרו 904. **משה בן ירמיה:** אל אל מאד 190
 אשור שיר 429 אתחננה לאל 468 יתברך וישתבח 853. **משה בן צור:** אמר על. **משה**
בר שבת: אתאנו לפניך 451. **משה בן שמואל הקראי:** אתה אהוב 454 אתחיל
 לשבח 467. **משה הגולה מקיעו (בן יעקב):** אתן שירה 476 באור יקר 477 להודות
 אל 897 סודות בנועות 1067 שמעו נבונים 1247. **משה זכות (בן מרדכי):** בעוד
 אחיה 518 התיצבו נגדי 641. **משה חיים קטאלאנו (בן אברהם):** דבר בתוך 548.
משה הכהן אבן גיקאטילא (בן שמואל): אקדישה לאל 400 (?) נשמת
 משכמי 1064 על עוני 1101. **משה כהן פורטו:** מקוה ירי 1024. **משה מבורך:** אלהים
 ברוב 267. **משה מענדלש (אב"ד דק"ק פראג):** אתה האל 457. **משה הסופר**
מרומא (בן בנימין): מפעלות מלכי 1022. **משה מפונטייוא:** בציון ינופף 522.
משה צפתי (בן שמואל): אלי הבן 282 אשב במצרים 427 לפרודך ידיד 933 נודריך
 הידיד 1043 קטון אני 1149. **משה רימוס:** מלך עולם 1006. **מתתיה:** מי כמוך 991,
 992 מלכי אדיר 1011 שמחו את ירושלים 1237.

נח מטרוקי (בן ישעיה): כמו פי 509 ראו האיש 1157. **נפתלי הכהן:** אאירי
 כבוד 3 אברך את ה' 27 אניד תהלות 34 אדרוש את ה' 67 אהלל את ה' 79 אורה את ה' 81
 אוכיר תהלות 130 אומרך ה' 135 נמלא פיני 1047, 1048 נעימות פאר 1050 נעלם ונסתר 1051.

סהל אבן אברהם: שמתם לבבי 1251. **סעדיה:** אוחילה לקדוש 87. **סעדיה**
טויל (בן משה): נפשי יחידה 1058. **סעדיה לונגו:** אישים בלי 180 אל הרואה 211
 אם הוד 303 אנבל את נבלי 360 אש תאוו 423 בבחרותו נבר 482 נבר בעת 541 נבר בתבל 542
 דפקו על 564 הנערה יפה 620 אתמה זקנה 471 זעום פנים 684 חשק ביום 708 ימי רעה 794 ימיני
 עם 800 יעלה מתקשטת 809 כל הנשים 872 כלה דברך 874 כמו כדור 877 לפנים לנביא 932
 מה לך 964 מחמד תבל 980 מסלר עם 1016 סבה ועלה 1066 על התמורות 1096 פנו לראי 1122
 צא לך 1128 שוב בך 1200 שער לבן 1266. **סעיד בן מרחב:** אנא אל 356.

עובדיה מברטינורא (בן אברהם ירא): עדי כסא 1080. **עזריה מן**
האדמים (בן משה): שמע קולי 1245. **עמור אביטבול:** הזכירו חסדי 590.
עמנואל בן יעקב: אני היום 376 כנפי נשרים 878. **עמנואל פראנשים (בן**
דוד): סורה אלי 1068.

פינחס: אדון כנלה⁴⁴. **פינחס בן אלעזר:** עשה נסים¹¹¹⁴. **פרץ:** מצות ציצית¹⁰²³.

צדקיהו הרופא מהענוים (בן בנימין): אקרא צור⁴⁰⁴ צור ישועתי¹¹³⁸.
צמח גאון (בן ר' אחאי גאון): אלי אלהים²⁸¹.

רחביה בן יהודה מבלנסיה: מי כמוכה^{992A}. **רחמים קלעי:** זמן הרע⁶⁸¹. **רפאל:** עורה כבודי¹⁰⁸⁵. **רפאל מפאינצה (בן יצחק):** רעיתי לי¹¹⁷⁶.
רפאל משה אלבאז: אבא היום⁸ אבי מעון¹⁰ אביעה חידות¹² אבכה במר¹⁸, 19 אבכה יום²⁰ אבלה נפשי²³ אדבר וירוח³⁶ ה' שוכן⁵⁵ אויבי אמילם⁸⁹ אחוה דעי¹⁴² אחר מי¹⁴⁹ אל הלחם²⁰⁹ אל עיר²³⁹ אלהי אבטח²⁶⁰ אליכם אישים²⁹³ אמרו לאחותיכם³³⁸ אמרתי אספרה³⁴⁸ אנא דודי³⁵⁷ אעורר זמרת³⁹⁰ אעיר זמרת³⁹¹ אערוך מספד³⁹³ אערוך שירה³⁹⁴ אערוך תחנה³⁹⁵ אקוה לאל⁴⁰² אקרע סגור⁴⁰⁶, 407 אריד בשיחי⁴¹⁶ אשיחה במר⁴³¹ אשפוך שיחי⁴⁴¹ אתה אל⁴⁵⁵ בקש שיר⁵²⁶ דודי ברח⁵⁵² דודי שלח⁵⁵⁵ יה למדוה⁷⁴⁰ יודו לך⁷⁴⁹ יוצר את⁷⁷² ימשול בן⁸⁰² יצר סמוך⁸³² כי תשאלו⁸⁶⁸ לב חכם⁸⁹⁰ לבי יועק⁸⁹⁴ לי הוגר⁹⁰² לי יאות⁹⁰³ לך ידיר⁹⁰⁹ לנדוד יעלת⁹²³ לספור לצרה⁹²⁶ מה דמות⁹⁵⁴ מה לי⁹⁶² מלך רחמן¹⁰⁰⁷ מספד מר¹⁰¹⁷, 1018 מעי אוחילה¹⁰¹⁹ נורא תהלות¹⁰⁴⁴ עיני יורדה¹⁰⁹⁰, 1091 צור מעון¹¹³⁹ קח ידידי¹¹⁴⁷ רצונך יסר¹¹⁷⁷ רצית האל¹¹⁷⁸ שובה עד¹²⁰² שפחת שרי¹²⁵⁸ תהי אונך¹²⁷² תורה צוה¹²⁷⁴ תורת אמת¹²⁷⁶.

שבתי: שעה ניב¹²⁵⁴. **שבתי מאוטרנטו:** מה יפית⁹⁵⁹ שמעו עם¹²⁴⁸ שמעי בת¹²⁴⁹. **שבתי כהן (בן מלכיאל):** אלהים חי²⁷¹. **שלם שבזי משתא (בן יוסף):** אפתח ביום³⁹⁶. **שלמה:** ועמך תמוך⁶⁶⁹ מי מוכה⁹⁹³ ש... רנה תדבר¹¹⁸¹ (?)
שאלו ישאלון¹¹⁸⁶ שוכן ברום¹²⁰³ שומר את¹²⁰⁸ שועתי מהר¹²⁰⁹ שורש תחנונו¹²¹³ שורש ישי¹²¹⁴ שוש אישי¹²¹⁵ שי אונות¹²¹⁹ שי אקריב¹²²⁰ שעריך בדפקי¹²⁵⁷ שש אנכי¹²⁶⁷.
שלמה אבן גבירול (בן יהודה): אז באין¹¹³ אלהים אלפתה²⁶⁹ אלי וילון²⁸³ אם ארדפה²⁹⁹ אמרו למי³⁴¹ (?) לך לך⁹¹¹ מה לך⁹⁶⁷ נשמת המון¹⁰⁶³ שוכן עד¹²⁰⁵ שלמך כטל¹²³¹ שמים ואורם¹²⁴⁰ (?)
שלמה מאורבינא (בן אברהם): שאון קול¹¹⁸⁷. **שלמה בונפיד (בן ראובן):** בעדן נן⁵¹⁷ חסד גמול⁷⁰¹ לו חכמו⁸⁹⁸.
שלמה בן דוד: החתן הזה⁵⁹³ שמחי ועלוי¹²³⁸. **שלמה בן שמואל ספרדי:** על שבר¹¹⁰³. **שלמה גדין:** ה' בקר⁵¹. **שלמה מבורך:** אל על²⁴¹ אמור לאלהינו³²⁷ בגילה באהבה⁴⁸⁴ בקראי עניי⁵²⁴ מלוא אש⁹⁹⁹ על מה¹⁰⁹⁹ ש... ולבוש¹¹⁸⁰ שחר אעירה¹²¹⁷ שעה נא¹²⁵³. **שלמה מן האדמים (בן משה בן יקותיאל):** אלהים ונהתנו²⁷⁰. **שלמה רוסו:** שכור רע¹²²⁸ שכחתי מאכול¹²²⁹ שמור וזכור¹²³⁶. **שם טוב:** שאו למרום¹¹⁸³. **שם טוב פלקירא (בן יוסף):** איכה יחי¹⁶² אל תהיה²⁵⁰ אם חטא³⁰⁷ אם יעלה³¹⁰ אנשי זמן³⁸³ באשה אל⁴⁷⁹ בדבר אמת⁴⁸⁵ בני איש⁵¹⁵ די לאנוש⁵⁵⁷ די לך⁵⁵⁸ דע כי⁵⁶³ הרב הב⁵⁷⁵ הן באמת⁶⁰⁷ הן הפרי⁶⁰⁹ הן כל⁶¹⁰ הסר כעס⁶²³ הקשב דבר⁶²⁹ השמר מבא⁶³⁷ השתעשעה תמיד⁶³⁸ וצאן לא⁶⁷¹ חכם ועשה⁶⁹³ חרב בפי⁷⁰⁵ חרפת בני⁷⁰⁶ יהלל איש⁷⁴⁶ יומם ולילה⁷⁶⁸ יין בעת⁷⁸⁷ יקר ועו⁸³⁶

ירא משנאך 839 יש בזמן 844 ישתבח יוצרי 852 כמה בשרי 876 כסיל ינאה 879 כסיל ימר 880
 כסיל ירום 881 לא נשאר 885 לבי עבד 895 למה בחיי 917 מרבה מליו 1029 נער במעלליו 1052
 על כן 1097 צפור מרגנת 1140 קנה בין 1151 רעי ומודעי 1174 שפל רוח 1259 תנו שכר 1284.
 שמואל: אל אדיר 185 אתה ראשון 463 אתן לדר 474 כי שכחתי 867 שאי רעיה 1188 שום
 חשים 1207 שיר חדש 1222 שם טוב 1232. שמואל אבן שושן (בן יוסף): אדבר נא 37
 גביר המעולה 540 הן המשושים 608 בעת 1227. שמואל אריפול: יחידה בעבודת 783
 שאו הרים 1182 שבילים טבעות 1194. שמואל ארקוולטי (בן אלחנן יעקב): אם
 אומר 297 אם מן הדין 317 אמאס אתעב 325 הנר כל 622 למה עדי 918 לפני מעתיק 931 עורי
 יחידתי 1086 עת נפשות 1116 שמע בני 1243. שמואל בן מימון: לך מבין 913. שמואל
 בן סעיד: שירו נא 1225. שמואל ברושלום?: שמעתי איד 1250. שמואל יזכה
 השלישי (בן הושענא): נבקעו ברביעי 1040. שמואל הנגיד (בן יוסף
 הלוי): אדום הלחי 39 אש אהבים 419 עיני בת 1089. שמואל צרפתי (בן אהרן): אני
 ספר 379, 380 אתמול לאליה 472 מורה נבוכים 977 קרא שיחות 1154. שמחה קלימאני: רק
 ילכו 1179. שמעון הכהן בירבי מנס: איש תם 178 שוכן עד 1204 שושנת עמק 1216.
 שמריה האקריטי (בן אליהו): אור היקר 104 שקט לבבי 1264. שמשון כהן
 מדון: הפוערים פיהם 625 רוח ונונים 1169, 1170.

תנחום: אנשי קדש 384.

MAX LILIENTHAL IN RUSSIA

DAVID PHILIPSON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

SOME time ago the genial librarian of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York City, Professor Alexander Marx, wrote me that among some manuscript material in the Seminary library he had come across an interesting exchange of letters between Dr. Max Lilienthal and Professor Samuel David Luzzatto. In response to my request he had photostatic copies made of the letters. An examination of the letters showed that they dealt with the Russian phase of Lilienthal's activity. In my book *Max Lilienthal, American Rabbi*, (New York 1915), I had devoted a lengthy chapter, pages 12-45, to the brave but futile plan sponsored by Uwarof the imperial minister of education under Czar Nicholas I to reform the educational system of Russian Jewry. Max Lilienthal, a recent graduate of the University of Munich, had been recommended to Uwarof by Ludwig Philippon, the editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* and possibly the best known European Jewish leader, as fitted to undertake this great and novel task. After his arrival in Russia in 1840 Lilienthal addressed communications to a number of leading European Jews such as Leopold Zunz, Abraham Geiger, Samuel David Luzzatto, and others, in which he explained what he was attempting to do and asked their cooperation by recommending to him teachers who could assist him in the work he had undertaken to perform. The letter to Luzzatto and his answer which Professor Marx so kindly called to my attention belong to this period. This correspondence is published here in full for the first time. I am including also the translation of a letter on the same theme written by Lilienthal to Rabbi Isaac Loewi of Fuerth in Bavaria, a fellow student of his in the famous Yeshibah of Wolf Hamburger in Fuerth, and at this time (1841) rabbi of the Fuerth congregation. This manuscript came into my possession many years ago. I published a translation in a memorial address on Dr. Lilienthal which I delivered in April 1892 on the tenth anniversary of his demise.

THE LILIENTHAL-LUZZATTO CORRESPONDENCE

Pietroburgo 5/17 Febbrajo 1841

Amatissimo Sigr. Professore

Il Collegio rabbinico di Padova é divenuto sotto la di Lei esimia direzione la scuola modello per tutti i futuri analoghi Istituti. Uomini segnalati per la mente e pel cuore sono di lá usciti ad ornamento d'Israel, ed egli é solo di Lei merito se delle comunioni si sentono felici sotto tali Conduttori. Il di Lei agire ha tirato a se l'attenzione anche di sua alta eccellenza il Sigr. Ministro della pubblica istruzione Uwarof e presentamente occupato ad impedire la rovina dei nostri Correligionarj in Russia e Polonia inferiori e piú alti stabilimenti letterarj, per prepararli mediante la coltura ad un migliore avvenire, egli vuole anche istituire pei Conduttori del popolo una simile scuola di Rabbini. Incaricato da sua alta eccellenza il quale da Riga ove io esercito le funzioni di Predicatore e direttore d'una scuola superiormente approvata; mi chiamó qui a prendere parte del consiglio pel miglioramento della nostra nazione dirigo a V. S. l'istanza di volermi fare pervenire al piú presto possibile un dettagliato piano sopra il di lei Istituto. Egli é veramente un gran lavoro che io le chiedo, tuttavia spero dall'infiammato zelo da cui Ella é per la nra. nazione animato, e dall'amore con cui Ella lavora per la inteletuale coltura di essa ch'Ella non mi negherá questa preghiera e vorrá benignamente farmi in breve pervenire in lingua francese o tedesca l'accenato piano; poiché v'é pericolo in mora.

Se mai la Russia potesse avere il bene di vedere collocati a Direttori delle 800 scuole che devono erigersi, alcuni uomini usciti dalla di Lei scuola i quali non avessero ancora alcun posto, io mi stimerei felice d'avere prestato allo stato un simile servizio, e d'avere fatto trovare a quegli uomini una sfera d'attività in cui poter esercitare le proprie forze con fortuna e successo. D'altronde essi hanno qui una felice prospettiva, che non ha l'eguale in alcuna altra parte. Sarebbero al servizio dello stato istalati e stipediati dallo stato, dalla Russia premiati per la

difusione della coltura dei lumi e ciò che supera ancor il premio é la riconoscenza dello stato, essi troverebbero col tempo qui adempiute le piú ardite speranze.

Se quegli uomini si sentono disposti a prendere parte nella grand' opera del קידוש השם li prego tostamento al ricevere la lettera mandarmi franchi di porto le loro attestati e le loro raccomandazioni coll'indicazione del luogo della loro dimora per notificare loro in breve le decisioni del Governo. Ma é d'uopo sollecitudine עת לעשות לה. Due milioni della nra. na[zione] languiscono in una miseria che noi non conosciamo, sospirano in una p[word missing] di cui non abbiamo idea, e le loro cattene devono essere rotte la loro inopia deve cessare: é questo un atto ed un merito il cui simile non si é mai presentato nella storia d'Israel. In premio della coltura viene offerta l'Emanzipazione, in premio dei lumi i diritti dell'uomo. Son convinto che V. S. si sentirá onorato di poter cooperare in qualche parte a questa grand' opera della salute d'Israel e con ciò poter ai proprj meriti aggiungerne un nuovo. Ma sia Ella solecito poiché la cosa urge. Frattanto pregandola d'accettare l'assicurazione della mia distinta considerazione rimango pieno di stima

di V. S. devotissimo

Predicatore Dr. Lilienthal

La prego non pubblicare nulla in alcun foglio. Il Ministro ha ciò espressamente proibito. Non vogliamo rovinare la cosa con una indiscretezza.

St. Petersburg 5, February 17, 1841.*

Dear Professor:

Under your distinguished direction the "Collegio Rabbinico" of Padua has become a model school for all future institutions of a similar nature. Men outstanding for their qualities of mind and heart have issued thence to the adornment of the house of

*I am indebted to Mrs. Sheldon H. Blank for the translations from the Italian.

Israel, and it is due to you alone that these communities are privileged to enjoy such leadership. Your activities have also drawn to themselves the attention of his eminent Excellency the Minister of Public Instruction Mr. Uwarof. He is at present occupied in an attempt to avoid the collapse of the elementary and secondary schools of our coreligionists in Russia and Poland, by preparing them, through cultural training for a better future. He also desires to institute a similar school for Rabbis who are later to become leaders of the people. His eminent Excellency called me from Riga, where I exercise the function of preacher and director of an officially approved school, to participate in a conference on the improvement of our nation. He charges me to request you to send me, as soon as possible a detailed plan of your Institute. This is, indeed, a great task which I ask of you; nevertheless I trust that, because of your burning zeal for our nation and the love with which you work for its intellectual betterment, you will not deny this prayer and that you will kindly soon forward to me the aforementioned plan either in the French or German language; for there is danger in delay.

If it were ever possible for Russia to have the benefit of seeing some men from your Seminary, who have as yet no positions, appointed as directors of the eight hundred schools which are to be founded, I would consider myself happy both to have rendered the state such a service and to have found for these men a sphere of activity in which they could exercise their proper functions, with good fortune and success. Moreover these men would have a better prospect here than could be equalled elsewhere. They would be installed and salaried by the state: Russia would reward them for the diffusion of knowledge and culture, and excelling even that reward, would be the gratitude of the state. They would in time find here the fulfillment of their most ardent hopes.

Will such men as feel themselves disposed to take part in the great mission of **קידוש השם** please send me post-paid immediately upon the receipt of this letter their certificates and recommendations, also their addresses in order that they may be informed of the government's decision without delay? But

haste is necessary—'עַל לַעֲשׂוֹת לֵה'. Two million of our people languish in a misery of which we have no conception—they sigh in a (word missing) of which we have no idea, but their chains are to be broken and their need is to cease. This is an opportunity and a cause the like of which has never before arisen in the history of Israel. Once they have attained culture they are offered emancipation; in the wake of knowledge—the rights of man. I am convinced that you will feel honored to cooperate in some part in this great effort for the good of Israel, and to all your previous good deeds to add yet another. But please make all possible haste for the matter is urgent. Meanwhile please accept the assurance of my deep consideration; I remain yours respectfully and devotedly,

Preacher Dr. Lilienthal.

Please do not publish any of this in any newspaper. The Minister has expressly forbidden it. We do not wish to ruin the plan by any indiscretion.

Luzzatto's answer reads as follows:

Signore!

La lettera, onde mi onoraste é stata per me estremamente inattesa ed estremamente consolante. E qual cosa poteva essermi tanto inaspettata, quanto il vedere i miei deboli sforzi a pro' dei miei correligionarj conosciuti ed approvati da un ministro d'un sì grande sovrano? e qual cosa più consolante per me, che vedere lo zelo veramente filantropico e paterno, con cui il governo Russo si occupa del miglioramento dello stato degli Israeliti viventi sotto il suo dominio? Qual cosa per me più consolante che il vedere 2 milioni di discendenti di Giacobbe vivere sott'un governo che si addossa tante cure per promuovere in essi lo sviluppo intellettuale, e renderli capace d'un migliore avvenire?

E vedendomi onorato ed ecitato a cooperare in parte a sì grande e santa opera, potrò io esitare un istante a prestarmici con tutto il cuore, con tutta l'anima e con tutte le mie forze? Nò, senza dubbio. Ma per soddisfare ai desideri di S. E. il Sig^o Ministro

che col vostro onorato organo mi domanda il piano del Col. Rab. di qui che potrò io fare? Poco io potrei aggiungere a quan[to] ho già pubblicato nell' Allgem. Zeit. des Judenthums ·/. 19 Juni 1838 ·/. In vano io mi estenderò sul piano degli studi, poichè i testi di cui fo uso sono tutti inediti, tutti di mia composizione. Essi sono 1º Gram̄atica Ragionata della lingua Ebraica, 2. Elementi gram. del caldaismo Biblico e Talmudico, 3. teologia dogmatica, 4. Theologia morale, 5. Storia del secondo tempio (tutte queste opere sono scritte in lingua Italiana), 6. Traduzione ed esegesi del pentateuco, di Isaia Geremia, e parte Ezechiele e Giobbe ·/. la Traduzione é in italiano e l'esegesi in Ebraico ·/. Egli é con tutti queste scritti ·/. che io spiego nelle mie lezioni quotidiane e che gli allievi trascrivono di giorno in giorno ·/. che io tento di svilūpare nei miei uditori il sentimento del vero e del buono, inspirar loro attaccamento e venerazione per la religione dei nostri padri, far loro am̄irare ed amare la santa morale, l'umanità e la giustizia universale, che sono lo scopo continuo del mosaismo, come pure del Rabbiniismo, e nello stesso tempo sviluppare in essi, la sana, profonda, e libera critica, e mostrar loro le modificazione che il Mosaismo ha saluto nel corso dei secoli, e come gli antichi Rabbini hanno saputo / senza mai atterrarne l'assenza / accomodando all' esigenze dei tempi. D'altronde conviene rimarcare, ed é una circostanza essenziale, che gli allievi del Col. hanno primo d'entrarvi, percorso gli studj d'umanità e scienze filosofiche in qualche ginnasio e liceo della Monarchia; ed debbono anche dare (in un esame d'ammissione) delle prove d'una intelligenza, almeno mediocra dei libri Biblici e Rabbini, intelligenza che i giovani del Lom. Veneto hanno l'opportunità d'acquistare nelle scuole elementarie Ebbraihe, conosciute ed approvate dal governo le quale esistono in ogni comunita di questo Regno e sono obligatorio per tutti quelli che frequentano i giñasii ed i Licei. Essi sono per lo piu fornite d'istruttori sortiti dal Col. medesimo. Senza tutti questi studi preliminari 9 anni del Col. non potrebbero essere di grande profitto.

Si sa d'altronde che il Col. ha anche un altro professore ·/. il dotto Sig^r Lelio della Torre membro corrispondente dell' accademia di Padova ·/. il quale insegna l'intelligenza del

Talmud, e ne fa percorrere quei trattati che concernano i Riti ed altre legge, che sono ancora in uso fra noi ed il quale insegna ancora tutti i dettagli di queste istesse leggi in alcune compendi metodici di sua composizione. A lui parimente appartiene l'insegnamento della predicazione.

Ciascheduno dei due professori da' lezione 3 ore al giorno. Tutti i sabbati e le altre feste degli Israeliti è vacanza, e mezza vacanza ogni martedì e venerdì. Vi sono altreai 15 giorni di vac^a alla Pasqua, e 2 mesi all'Autuño ∙/. Settemb. e 8^{bre} ∙/. se a fino qual punto il piano di questo Col. sia applicabile agli Israeliti della Russia, e se e fino a qual punto, dei Rabbini istruiti con questo metodo ed in questi principii potrebbero essere utile agli Ebrei Russi e Polachi, io non lo so. Certamente l'adversione agli studi letterarj e scientifici non ha mai preso radici presso gli Ebrei d'Italia, come presso quelli del Nord. E frattanto questo Col. ed i Rabbini che ne sono sortiti hanno anche in Italia un piu o meno considerabile partito di opposizione, ed é da attribuirsi non tanto alla superiorità dei lumi, quanto ad una vita esemplare contrati di sacrificio ed annegazione poco comuni che gli allievi del Col. si guadagnano l'amore e la confidenza della comunità. L'opposizione a Rabbini illuminati deve essere mille volte piu forte in Polonia ed in Russia: Il braccio del governo potrà ben sostenerli in posto. Ma dipende da essi ed unicamente da essi il sapersi mantenere in credito ed acquistarsi la confidenza pubblica colla loro propria moderazione e con una virtù esemplare. Mo ohimé che queste qualità sono rare in uomini passati subitamente dallo antiche tenebre alla luce della coltura moderna. Una somma circospezione e adunque necessaria nella scelta degli uomini che si vorrà collocare alla testa delle scuole, che si ha ad eseguire tanto in qualità di direttori quanto in qualità di precettori. In questa scelta mi sembra converrebbe aver piu riguardo all' integrità di condottà in morale ed in religione, ed alla moderazione del carattere, che all'estenzione dei lumi. Senza cio si corre pericolo di produrre una reazione, ed accrescere nel popolo l'adversione ai lumi stessi, eppure di affievolire negli allievi il sentimento religioso, sentimento piu preziose allo stato che qualunque

coltura letteraria e scientifica. Agli Individui che venissero eletti a direttori ed istruttori, io vorrei che mi fosse permesso di raccomandare una cosa, la quale forse non sarà da tutti accordata, ed è di rilevare ed amobilire negli Ebrei il sentimento nazionale, e lungi dal combatterlo e distruggerlo contentarsi di dargli una direzione salutare morale e fisica. Nessun popolo e nessun individuo saprebbe formarsi nobili e virtuosi sentimenti, senza un certo grado di stima di se stesso, e senza una certa coscienza della sua propria dignità e capacità. io vorrei che gli Israeliti conoscessero i loro propri difetti della loro educazione, che essi conoscessero che la loro religione è stata in parte negli ultimi secoli adulterata, che la scrittura ed il Talmud sorgente della più santa morale di saggezza, socialità ed amore sono state convertite in sorgenti di eterne e vane dispute, che questo studio ch'era destinato ad edificare, ed uniformarci alla virtù, fu cangiata in strumento di ambizione ed in esercizio di trattenimento; che quel ascettismo che altre volte sollevava l'uomo a Dio, è divenuto stromento d'ipocresia e simonia. Ma io vorrei nel tempo stesso che gli Ebrei conoscessero che la loro religione è santa, e divina; che la moderna civilizzazione è sua figlia, che essi sapero scelti al sacerdozio del genere umano, e conservatori della dottrina dell'unità di Dio, e della unità d'origine di tutte le nazione; e che il più sacro dovere dell'Israelito è il Kidusch Haschem, vale a dire di far conoscere la santità della sua religione, attivandosi coll' esemplarità della sua vita l'amore e la stima di tutt' il mondo. Ecco i sentimenti che io non cesso e non cessero mai d'inculcare, e se la mia istruzione ha prodotto qualche frutto prezioso, a ciò soltanto se lo debbe attribuire. Degli scolari sortiti da questo Col. nessuno si trova presentemente in istato di poter approfittare dell'onore che viene loro da S. E. il Sig.^l Ministro. Se fosse possibile che dei giovani della Russia venissero qui ad istruirsi, forse un giorno potrebbero servire utilmente la loro patria. Questo Col. ha presentemente il piacere di contare frai suoi scolari un Pollacco da Brodi, giovine delle più belle speranze. forse sarebbe un mezzo vantaggioso per la rigenerazione degli Israeliti della Russia, uno scritto periodico in ebraico, il quale senza irritare gli spiriti meno illuminati tendesse a combattere i pregiudizj ed a spandere nel popolo idee sane e sociali.

nel caso che questo mezzo piacesse al governo Russo, e ch'egli volesse incaricarsi della sua diffusione, io sarei pronto ad incaricarmi della sua redazione. Per me sarebbe la somma delle felicità il poter coi miei lavori servire al vantaggio non solo dei miei correligionari di qui ma anche di quelli che, in sì gran numero vovono in remote contrade, e formarne dei [sadditi] utili e degni della generosità dello stato che ha a cuore il loro progresso e la loro prosperità.

Vale aggradire o Signore, a S. E. il Sig^r Ministro i miei più profondi sentimenti di ammirazione e gratitudine (sic!) pel santo zelo di cui egli è animato pel bene di tanti infelici ed aggradite nello stesso tempo l'alta stima con cui o l'onore d'essere vostro devot^o servitore

S. D. L.

Padova 22 Marzo 1841.

Sir:

The letter with which you honored me was quite unexpected and extremely gratifying. What could be more unexpected than to see my poor efforts on behalf of my coreligionists recognized and approved by a minister of such a mighty sovereign? And what could be a greater comfort to me than to see the truly philanthropic and paternal zeal with which the Russian government seeks the betterment of those Jews who dwell in its dominion? What more cheering to my spirits than to see two million of the descendents of Jacob living under the aegis of a government which takes upon itself to promote in them an intellectual development which will render them capable of a better future?

And, inasmuch as I am honored by your request and urged to cooperate to some extent in so great and sacred a project, is it possible for me to hesitate even for an instant to lend myself to it with all my heart, all my soul, and with all my might? Without doubt, no. But in order to comply with the wishes of his Excellency the Minister and your honoured self,

who have asked for the plan of this Rabbinical college, what should I do? I could add little to that which I have already published in the *Allgem. Zeit. des Judenthums* (19th of June 1838). It would be useless for me to elaborate on the plan of studies, because the sources which I make use of are all unpublished, all of my own composition. They are (1) *Grammatica Ragionata della lingua Ebraica*, (2) *Elementi gram. del caldaismo Biblico e Talmudico*, (3) *Teologia dogmatica*, (4) *Teologia Morale*, (5) *Storia del secondo Tempio* (all of these works are written in the Italian language), (6) *Traduzione ed esegesi del Pentateuco, di Isaia, Geremia, e parte Ezechiele e Giobbe* (the translation is in Italian and the exegesis in Hebrew). Thus is it with all these writings (which I expound in my daily courses and which my pupils transcribe from day to day). Through them I try to develop in my listeners the feeling for truth and goodness and to inspire them toward attachment to and veneration for the religion of our fathers; to cause them to admire and love a sacred morality, humanity, and universal justice, which are the continual purpose of Mosaism as even of Rabbinism. At the same time I try to develop in my pupils a sane, profound, and liberal critical sense and to show them the modifications which the Mosaic law has undergone in the course of the centuries and how the ancient Rabbis knew how to adapt it to the exigencies of the times without ever destroying its essence.

Besides it is well to note, and it is an essential condition, that the pupils of the college before entering must have taken courses in the humanities and philosophical sciences in one or another elementary school and university of the Kingdom. They must also give proof (in an examination for admission) of, at least, a moderate knowledge of the writings of the Bible and the Rabbis; a knowledge of which the young men of the Lomb. Veneto have the opportunity to acquire in the elementary Hebrew schools which are recognized and approved by the government and are to be found in every community of this kingdom. Attendance at these schools is obligatory upon all those attending schools and universities. The instructors are, for the most part, former students of our college. Without all these

preliminary studies nine years of college could not be of much profit.

You know besides that the college has yet another professor, the learned Lelio della Torre, corresponding member of the Academy of Padua. He teaches Talmud, reading cursorily such treatises as concern the ritual and the laws observed by us. He deals with all the details of these same laws in systematically arranged volumes of his own composition. He also teaches homiletics.

Each of the two professors teaches three hours a day. The Sabbath and the other Jewish holidays are vacations, and every Tuesday and Friday is a half holiday. There are also fifteen days of vacation at Easter and two months in the autumn—September and October. I do not know up to what point the plan of this college could be adapted to the use of Russian Jews or up to what point those Rabbis, instructed according to this method and these principles, would be useful to the Jews of Russia and Poland. Certainly the aversion to the study of letters and of scientific subjects has never taken root amongst the Jews of Italy as it has amongst those of the North. Though this college and the Rabbis who have graduated from it have, in Italy also, met more or less opposition yet they have won the love and confidence of the community, and this is not to be attributed to the superiority of their intelligence so much as to their way of life, exemplifying sacrifice and self-abnegation to an uncommon degree. The opposition to enlightened Rabbis must be a thousand times greater in Poland and Russia. The arm of the government will know how to keep them in their posts but they and they only can know how to maintain the good-will and confidence of the public, by their own moderation and exemplary character. Alas! How rare are these qualities in men who have suddenly turned from the shadows of the past to the light of modern culture! It is consequently necessary to exercise proper circumspection in the choice of men who are to be allotted the position of principals in the schools, for they have to exercise the functions both of directors and teachers. In this choice it appears to me that it would be well to lay more emphasis on integrity of conduct in morals and

religion and on the moderation of character than on the extent of learning. Failing this one runs the risk of causing a reaction and of arousing an aversion to learning in the population, and also of weakening the religious feelings of the students, feelings more valuable to the state than any lettered or scientific culture.

To the individuals who come to be elected as directors and instructors I would wish to be allowed to recommend one thing—a thing which would not be agreed to by everyone—it is to revive and to remobilize in the Jews a national sentiment and, rather than to fight against it and destroy it, to be contented to direct it into salutary, moral and natural ways. No people and no individual can develop noble and virtuous sentiments without a certain degree of pride and without a certain consciousness of their own dignity and ability. I would wish that the Jews knew the defects of their education, that they recognized that in the last centuries their religion has been somewhat adulterated; that the scriptures and the Talmud, originating in the holiest morality, wisdom, social enlightenment and love, have been transformed into sources of endless and empty disputes; that this learning, which was intended to edify, and to conform with standards of goodness, has been changed into an instrument of ambition and triviality; that that asceticism, which, at other times, elevated man to God, has become an instrument of hypocrisy and simony. Nevertheless I would wish the Jews to know that their religion is holy and divine; that modern civilization is its daughter; to know themselves chosen as priests to humanity and teachers of the doctrine of Unity of God and of the single origin of all peoples; that the most sacred duty of the Jews is the *Ḳidduṣ Hašem*. Which all means to say that the Jew should make known the sanctity of his religion and call upon himself, by the exemplary quality of his life, the love and esteem of all the world. Here are the sentiments which I have ceaselessly tried and will without cease continue to try to inculcate, and if my instruction has borne some precious fruits it is to be attributed to these sentiments alone.

None of the scholars graduated from this college is at present able to profit by the honor which his Excellency the Minister offers them. If it were possible for some young men from Russia

to come here for instruction they might perhaps be of use to their country in the future. At present the College is fortunate enough to number a Pole from Brodi amongst its students, a young man giving the utmost promise. Perhaps an advantageous means toward the regeneration of the Jews of Russia would be a Hebrew periodical which should, without irritating the less enlightened, tend to combat prejudice and inculcate sane and social ideas amongst the people. If this proposition should prove pleasing to the Russian government and if it would take upon itself the burden of distribution I would be willing to undertake that of editorship. It would be a source of happiness to me to be able to give my services for the benefit, not only of my coreligionists here, but also of those who live in such great numbers in remote lands, to help to mold them into useful subjects (?) worthy of the generosity of the state which has their progress and their prosperity at heart.

I pray you Sir to express to his Excellency the Minister my most profound admiration and my gratitude for the sacred zeal with which he is animated for the benefit of so many unfortunates, and, at the same time, please accept the high esteem with which I have the honor to be your devoted servant.

S. D. L.

Padua, March 22, 1841.

Three days after addressing Luzzatto, Lilienthal wrote in similar strain to Rabbi Dr. Loewi of Fuerth Bavaria. This letter in translation reads thus:

St. Petersburg, February 8, 1841.

To the Rev. Dr. Loewi, Preacher and Rabbi in Fuerth near
Nürnberg, in Bavaria:

Reverend Sir:

It will be four weeks by the time you receive this letter that I will have been in St. Petersburg under the commission of the Government to learn its plans in reference to a moral, intellectual and religious improvement of our coreligionists.

Well nigh two millions of our people languish in a condition of wretchedness unknown to us; groan beneath a burden of poverty of which we Germans have not even a conception; bear the ignominy of the Middle Ages, which we have long since forgotten; live in a Chasidaic intellectual darkness which kills mind and heart and presents a picture of misery and wretchedness which surpasses all pictures of the most terrible imagination.

Yet all these fetters are to be removed. His Majesty, the Emperor, has favored the plan of the high-minded Minister of Education to emancipate the Jews. But they are to obtain this imperial gift only on condition of a thorough intellectual and moral education. Two hundred schools are to be opened throughout the Empire, elementary, city and high schools. The young people who pass through these schools are to receive all the rights of citizenship without trammel. This is a great and glorious thing, the like of which our history has not yet produced; not a too sudden deliverance from the bonds of the Middle Ages without being able to make use of the freedom, as happened in France; not a restless exertion and struggle without obtaining the least advantages, as in Germany. No, the exalted desire of the monarch is for education and emancipation, for culture and the rights of man.

But the men who are to be placed at the heads of these different institutions are wanting. Russia has them not. Germany shall furnish them. Men who feel called upon to take part in this great work of the regeneration of their people will, in insuring the happiness of their brethren, lay the foundation of their own good fortune. Appointed and paid by the state as officials of the state, protected by the state against the blind opposition of an unthinking fanaticism, a future brighter than they can ever hope for in Germany awaits them. In Bavaria there is a great number of young men who have finished or are about to finish their studies, and are unable to earn their living. I think of them with real pleasure, because I am able to prove by deed that I will gladly do anything to make them happy and have them provided for. Now, since I may hope that you, reverend sir, will not refuse me your active co-operation, both on account of your

love for these men and also your zeal for our great and holy cause, I venture to make the following request:

I do not know the addresses and homes of all these unengaged men. If I did I would have written to them personally and saved you the trouble; but since, by the express wish of the Minister, this matter is not to appear in any public journal before its consummation, and I therefore may not make any public appeal, I therefore beg you most urgently to write to these men immediately upon the receipt of this letter, since there is danger in delay, and request them to send to me to the address given below immediately upon the receipt of your letter, their testimonials together with their addresses, so that I can inform them shortly of the decision of the Government.

I beg you further most urgently to send me, immediately upon receipt of my letter, the names of the men to whom you will write, so that I may lay them before the Minister. Be there ever so many, they will all obtain a living and find their happiness and weal, each one according to his education.

The cause is a great and holy one, and therefore I count upon your enthusiastic co-operation; even though the trouble and labor that the matter will cost you be great, it is a great work; your reward and the gratitude and appreciation of your contemporaries and of posterity will be greater.

Happy to have again come into communication with you, reverend sir, I subscribe myself, yours with high regard, in the name of the Minister,

Preacher Dr. Lilienthal

Post rest. in St. Petersburg.

Let the gentlemen send their testimonials postage free. Make haste, I pray you.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE ANNUAL

The Hebrew Union College Annual appears annually. Contributions to its pages are invited from scholars. Communications should be addressed to:

The Hebrew Union College Annual,
The Hebrew Union College,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

TABLES OF CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS VOLUMES

VOLUME I—1924

A Study of the First Chapter of Genesis.

M. LAMBERT, Seminaire Rabbinique, Paris, France.

The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A Suggestion as to the Sequence of Some Prophecies in the First Isaiah.

WILLIAM POPPER, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Kharu, Horim, Dedanim.

E. TÄUBLER, Berlin, Germany.

The Riddle in the Bible.

HARRY TORCZYNER, Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, Berlin, Germany.

Implications of the Place of the Book of Ruth in Editions, Manuscripts, and Canon of the Old Testament.

L. B. WOLFENSON, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Service Tree in Bible and Talmud and in Modern Palestine.

SAMUEL KRAUSS, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna, Austria.

Early Christian Epigraphy, Considered from the Jewish Point of View.

LUDWIG BLAU, Landesrabbinerschule, Budapest, Hungary.

Asenath, the Wife of Joseph—A Haggadic, Literary-Historical Study.

V. APTOWITZER, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna, Austria.

The Religion of the Jews at the Time of Jesus.

LOUIS GINZBERG, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

Rabbinic Studies in the Synoptic Gospels.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Halaka in the Gospels and its Relation to the Jewish Law at the Time of Jesus.

SOLOMON ZEITLIN, Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Lost "Confession" of Samuel.

ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, Cambridge University, Cambridge, England.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions.

K. KOHLER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Arrangement and the Division of the Mekilta.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature.

A. MARMORSTEIN, Jews' College, London, England.

Saadya's Philosophy.

DAVID NEUMARK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Notes on Proofs of the Existence of God in Jewish Philosophy.

HARRY A. WOLFSON, Harvard University, Cambridge Mass.

Moses Ibn Ghiquitilla as Poet.

SAMUEL POZNANSKI, Warsaw, Poland.

With a Note by Israel Davidson, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Glimpses on the Life of an Italian Rabbi of the Sixteenth Century.

A. MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Destruction or Construction?

I. ELBOGEN, Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, Berlin, Germany.

VOLUME II—1925

Moses with the Shining Face.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Chaldaean Dynasty.

A. T. OLMSTEAD, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

The Problem of Inconsequent Post-Dating in II Kings XV. 13, 17 and 23.

W. J. CHAPMAN, Case Memorial Library, Hartford, Conn.

Notes on Parallelism.

WILLIAM POPPER, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Studies in Hebrew Roots and Their Etymology.

JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its Transformation in Christianity.

HERMANN VOGELSTEIN, Breslau, Germany.

Judaism in the Church.

LEO BAECK, Berlin, Germany.

Jewish Proper Names and Derivatives in the Koran.

JOSEPH HOROVITZ, University of Frankfurt, Germany.

The Decisions of Maimonides in his Commentary on the Mishna.

MICHAEL GUTTMAN, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau, Germany.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Origin of the Tahanun.

SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, Chicago, Ill.

The Ceremony of Breaking a Glass at Weddings.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Law of Nature, Hugo Grotius, and the Bible.

ISAAC HUSIK, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Some Unpublished Letters of Theological Importance.

DAVID PHILIPSON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

JUBILEE VOLUME—SPECIAL, 1925

The History of the Hebrew Union College.

DAVID PHILIPSON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Hebrew Union College of Yesterday and a Great Desideratum in its Curriculum Today.

KAUFMAN KOHLER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ezekiel 37:15-28 What Happened to the Ten Tribes.

WILLIAM ROSENAU, Baltimore, Md.

The Importance of the Tenses for the Interpretation of the Psalms.

MOSES BUTTENWIESER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Trial by Ordeal among the Semites and in Ancient Israel.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Men of the Great Synagogue.

HENRY ENGLANDER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Palestine in Jewish Theology.

SAMUEL S. COHEN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Names of the Rabbinical Schools and Assemblies in Babylon.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Gaonic Studies.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Classification of Sciences in Medieval Jewish Philosophy.

HARRY A. WOLFSON, Jewish Institute of Religion, New York.

Pico Della Mirandola.

ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, Cambridge University, Cambridge, England.

Raphael Norzi: A Rabbi of the Renaissance.

H. G. ENELOW, New York.

Notes on Sephardic Jewish History of the Sixteenth Century.

JACOB RADER MARCUS, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Songs and Singers of the Synagogue in the Eighteenth Century.

A. Z. IDELSOHN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Early Reform in Contemporaneous Responses.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Negative Tendencies in Modern Hebrew Literature.

JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Social Implications of Prayer.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Philosophy of Judaism and How It Should Be Taught.

DAVID NEUMARK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

VOLUME III—1926

The Term "Foreigner" (זכרי) Historically Considered.

MICHAEL GUTTMAN, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau, Germany.

Musical Instruments in the Old Testament.

SOL BARUCH FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Additional Notes on "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel."

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Some Notes on the Text of the Scriptures.

JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Rewarding and Punishing of Animals and Inanimate Things According to the Aggadic View of the World.

V. APTOWITZER, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna, Austria.

Early Christian Archaeology from the Jewish Point of View.

LUDWIG BLAU, Landesrabbinschule, Budapest, Hungary.

Kalir Studies.

I. ELBOGEN, Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, Berlin, Germany.

A Didactic Poem of Šahlal b. Netanel Gaon.

ISRAEL DAVIDSON, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

A Second Supplement to "The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fātimid Caliphs."

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Additional Note to Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume.

JACOB MANN.

The Correspondence between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides about Astrology.

ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

Two Letters from Abraham Firkovich.

ABRAHAM KAHANA, Tel Aviv, Palestine.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Additional Notes to the article on the Classification of Sciences in Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy (Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume).

HARRY A. WOLFSON, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

VOLUME IV—1927

The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Die Bibel und die jüdische Religionsphilosophie der Gegenwart.

ALBERT LEWKOWITZ, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau, Germany.

Die Lehre vom ungeschriebenen Gesetz im jüdischen Schrifttum.

I. HEINEMANN, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau, Germany.

A Significant Controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Spuren des Matriarchats im jüdischen Schrifttum.

V. APTOWITZER, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Wien.

Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecutions.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Midrash Hashkem Quotations in Alnaqua's Menorat Ha-Maor.

H. G. ENELOW, Temple Emanu-El, New York City.

Sprachliche Bemerkungen zum Texte des Sepher Ma'asijoth, ed. Gaster.

SAMUEL KRAUSS, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Wien.

"Gott wünscht das Herz": Legenden über einfältige Andacht und über den Gefahren im Paradies.

BERNHARD HELLER, Landesrabbinerschule, Budapest.

Kalir-Studien.

I. ELBOGEN, Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, Berlin.

Gabirol's Authorship of the "Choice of Pearls" and the two Versions of Joseph Kimhi's "Shekel Haqodesh."

ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

תעודות מכתב"יד.

JACOB MOSES TOLEDANO, Tangier, Morocco.

Additional Note to Toledano's Article.

JACOB MANN.

The Astrolabe in Jewish Literature.

SOLOMON GANDZ, Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, New York City.

Bendel Ahrweiler.

M. GINSBURGER, Strasbourg.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Additions and Corrections to "The Correspondence Between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides About Astrology" (in the Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. III, 1926).

ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

VOLUME V—1928

The Book of the Covenant.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Poems of Haggai.

PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

Das tannaitische Grenzverzeichnis Palästinas.

SAMUEL KLEIN, Nové Zámky, Czecho-Slovakie.

Spuren des Matriarchats im jüdischen Schrifttum (Schluss und Nachträge).

V. APTOWITZER, Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, Wien.

The Jewish Catacombs and Inscriptions of Rome.

H. J. LEON, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

An Unknown Hebrew Version of the Sayings of Aesop.

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

The Memoirs of a Siennese Jew.

CECIL ROTH, London.

מכתבי־יד.

JACOB MOSES TOLEDANO, Tangier, Morocco.

Die Teleologie bei Maimonides.

Z. DIESENDRUCK, Wien.

War Nachman Krochmal Hegelianer?

SIMON RAWIDOWICZ, Berlin-Charlottenburg.

Divine Help as a Social Phenomenon.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

VOLUME VI—1929

The Gates of Righteousness.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Fear and Love of God in the Old Testament.

BERNARD BAMBERGER, Albany, N. Y.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Rabbinic Parallels in Early Church Orders.

F. GAVIN, The General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

The Pharisees and Their Teachings.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Background of the Haggadah.

A. MARMORSTEIN, Jews College, London, England.

Arabisch-Jüdische Schöpfungstheorien.

V. APTOWITZER, Wien.

Studies in History of Mathematics from Hebrew and Arabic Sources.

I. The Terminology of Multiplication in Arabic and Hebrew Sources.

II. The Mishnat Ha-Middot or The First Hebrew Geometry Written
About 150 C. E., Prolegomena to a New Edition.

SOLOMON GANDZ, The Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary and
Yeshiva College, New York City.

Eliezer Crescas and his Bet Zebul, the Bible References in Talmud and Midrash.

MOSES GASTER, London, England.

The Sermons of Judah Moscato.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mendelssohn as Translator and Exegete.

HENRY ENGLANDER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

*Supplement to "An Unknown Hebrew Version of the Sayings of Aesop," Hebrew
Union College Annual, Vol. V, pp. 315-352.*

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

VOLUME VII—1930

The Character and Date of Ezekiel's Prophecies

MOSES BUTTENWIESER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Book of the Covenant, Part II.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

The Septuagint Renderings of Old Testament Terms for Law.

SHELDON H. BLANK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Present State of Textual Criticism of the Old Testament.

JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia.

Al-Qirgisānī's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity.

LEON NEMOY, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn.

Rashi's View of the Weak, y'y, and י'פ Roots.

HENRY ENGLANDER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

L'exégèse Biblique des Juifs d'Allemagne au Moyen Age.

M. GINSBURGER, Strasbourg, France.

The Sermons of Azariah Figo.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Letters of Rabbi Mahalalel Halelujah of Ancona.

SIMON BERNSTEIN, New York.

The Love Letters of Bendet Schottlaender.

JACOB R. MARCUS, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

VOLUME VIII-IX—1931-32

The Book of the Covenant, Part III—The Huggim.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Palestinian Chronological Data, 750-700 B. C.

WILLIAM JOHN CHAPMAN, New Boston, Massachusetts.

Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia.

A. KAMINKA, Maimonides-Institut, Wien.

The Shofar.

SOL. B. FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A Hebrew Bible Ms. in the Hebrew Union College Library.

SHELDON H. BLANK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Die Fastenrolle, eine Untersuchung zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Geschichte,
מגולת חגיגה.

HANS LICHTENSTEIN, Tel-Abib.

Die Homiletische Peroratio im Midrasch.

EDMUND STEIN, Warschau.

Untersuchungen zur Gaonäischen Literatur.

V. APTOWITZER, Wein.

The Sermons of Ephraim Luntshitz.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

היהודים בטאניר.

JACOB M. TOLEDANO, Cairo, Egypt.

The Kol Nidre Tune.

A. Z. IDELSOHN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mitwirkung von Frauen beim Gottesdienste.

MEIR FRIEDMANN, s. A.

"Evreiskaia Starina"—A Bibliography of the Russian-Jewish Historical Periodical.

ABRAHAM G. DUKER, New York, New York.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

The Psychoanalytic Study of Judaism.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Addenda to "The Book of the Covenant, Part III—The Haggim," above,
pp. 1-150.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

VOLUME X—1935

Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Die Mystischen Ideen des R. Simon Ben Johai.

A. KAMINKA, Wien.

*Schriftgeschichtliche Beobachtungen an den beiden Griechischen Buchstaben
Γ und X deren sich der Talmud zur Bezeichnung von Gestalten bedient.*

ELIAS FINK, Frankfurt a. M.

The Mishna Text in Babylonia, Fragments from the Geniza.

P. KAHLE and T. WEINBERG, Bonn.

Judaism and Christianity in the Middle of the Third Century.

A. MARMORSTEIN, London.

Zu Dr. Mann's neuen Historischen Texten.

SAMUEL KRAUSS, Wien.

Rejoinder.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Nachbemerkung.

SAMUEL KRAUSS

The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Psalms 42-72.

SIDNEY I. ESTERSON, Baltimore.

Deux Pourims Locaux.

M. GINSBURGER, Strasbourg, France.

Some Revolutionary Purims (1790-1801).

CECIL ROTH, London

Luhot Abanim, Part II.

SIMON BERNSTEIN, New York.

The Sermons of Jonathan Eybeshitz.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

VOLUME XI—1936

Personal Contacts with the Founder of the Hebrew Union College.

DAVID PHILIPSON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Amos Studies I.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Boundaries of Edom.

NELSON GLUECK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism.

SHELDON H. BLANK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hā'iddānā

IMMANUEL LÖW, Szegedin, Hungary.

Tashlik, A Study in Jewish Ceremonies.

JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Samuel and Moses Ibn Tibbon on Maimonides' Theory of Providence.

Z. DIESENDRUCK, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Grammatical Elements and Terminology in Rashi's Biblical Commentaries.

HENRY ENGLANDER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Sermons of Jacob Anatoli.

ISRAEL BETTAN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A Final Word to Krauss' "Nachbemerkung" HUCA, X, 307-308.

JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Gershom (Hieronymus) Soncino's Wander-Years in Italy, 1498-1527. Exemplar Judaicae Vitae.

MOSES MARX, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Me'il Zedakah.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Traditional Songs of the German (Tedesco) Jews in Italy.

ABRAHAM Z. IDELSOHN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Authority in Judaism.

SAMUEL S. COHON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

R. Mo'šeh al-Ro'ṭi (אלר״ש).

MICHAEL WILENSKY, Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

- Volume I, 639 pages, (out of print)
Volume II, 433 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume III, 375 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume IV, 494 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume V, 620 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume VI, 350 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume VII, 577 pages, bound, \$1.50
Volume VIII-IX, 746 pages, bound, \$3.00
Volume X, 597 pages, bound, \$3.00
Volume XI, 649 pages, bound, \$3.00
Volume XII-XIII, 839 pages, bound, \$3.00
Jubilee Volume, 521 pages, (out of print)

Copies may be secured from:

THE DEPARTMENT OF SYNAGOG AND SCHOOL EXTENSION
Merchants Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio
U. S. A.

18274

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

Hebrew...Annual..12-13

**LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.**



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

